Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-152
Wednesday
9 August 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-152 CONTENTS *9 August 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Bogachev Criticizes Bush's Fort Myer Speech *[TASS]* 1
Fourth Round of Nuclear Test Ban Talks Ends *[TASS]* 1
Karpov Assesses Geneva Nuclear Arms Talks *[TASS]* 1
Status of Nuclear, Space Arms Talks Discussed *[PRAVDA 8 Aug]* 2
Moscow-NATO TV Linkup Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jul]* 2
Risk Reduction Center Head Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Aug]* 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Petrovskiy on Proposal for UN Peace-Keeping Force *[TASS]* 6
Briefing Cites Contacts With U.S. on Afghanistan *[IZVESTIYA 5 Aug]* 6
NATO's Woerner Speaks on East-West Relations *[TASS]* 6
Brutents on Foreign Socialist, Communist Parties *[ARGUMENTI I FAKTY No 30]* 7
War Veterans Discuss Disarmament at Conference *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jul]* 9
Ecological Group Meets to Discuss Baltic Sea *[TASS]* 9
Aeroflot Becomes Member of IATA *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jul]* 10

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. 'Aircraft Carrier Diplomacy' Viewed *[Moscow Radio Peace and Progress]* 11
Reportage on U.S. Navy Visit to Sevastopol 11
More on Sevastopol Welcome *[PRAVDA 5 Aug]* 11
U.S. Naval Squadron Ends Visit *[TASS]* 12
U.S. Navy Official Praises Visit *[TASS]* 12
Black Sea Commander on Visit *[TASS]* 12
Bush Repeats 'Peace Through Strength' Call *[Moscow International]* 13
Reportage on U.S. Armed Services Delegation Visit 13
U.S. Delegation Arrives *[TASS]* 13
Delegation Meets With Akhromeyev *[TASS]* 13
Karpov Receives U.S. Congressmen *[TASS]* 13
V.F. Petrovskiy Receives TIME's Chief Editor *[IZVESTIYA 3 Aug]* 14

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Crewmen From Sinking Soviet Tanker Missing *[Tokyo KYODO]* 14
Analyst Views Paris Conference Outcome *[TASS]* 14
'First Phase' of Paris Cambodia Talks Assessed *[Valentinov on Moscow International]* 15
UN Asked To Drop Khmer Coalition Recognition *[Moscow International]* 15
Malaysian Ambassador Presents Credentials 7 Aug *[Moscow International]* 16

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Defense Minister Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 8 Aug]* 16
Afghan Army Leaders on 'Jalalabad Front' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Aug]* 18

East Europe

PZPR's Rakowski Cited on Party Tasks *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Aug]* 19
Polish Politburo Discusses Walesa Statement *[TASS]* 19
Efforts To Form Polish Government Continue *[Moscow Radio]* 19

New Polish Premier Kiszczak Profiled *[PRAVDA 3 Aug]* 20
Jaruzelski, Rakowski Plenum Speeches Cited *[PRAVDA 1 Aug]* 20
Poland's Economic Problems, Reforms Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 1 Aug]* 21
Polish-Made Helicopter Tested in Turkmenistan *[Moscow Radio]* 22
Polish WWII Withdrawal to Iran Examined *[PRAVDA 30 Jul]* 22

Latin America & Caribbean

Gorbachev Sends Condolences to Castro *[TASS]* 23
Supreme Soviet Group Ends Visit to Honduras *[TASS]* 23

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Supreme Soviet 4 Aug Proceedings Reported 24
Decree on Crime, Corruption Approved *[Moscow TV]* 24
Protocol, Consular Agreement Ratified *[Moscow TV]* 24
Konarev Candidacy Debated *[Moscow TV]* 25
Konarev Elected Railway Minister *[Moscow TV]* 26
Supreme Soviet Ratifies Supplementary Protocol *[TASS]* 26
Lukyanov Interviewed on Supreme Soviet Results *[Moscow TV]* 26
Late July Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reviewed *[PRAVDA 30 Jul]* 36
Supreme Soviet Proceedings Highlighted *[PRAVDA 23 Jul]* 37
Formation of New USSR Government Assessed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Jul]* 38
Deputies Comment on Supreme Soviet Session *[TRUD 14 Jul]* 41
Situation 'Tense' in Abkhaziya; Passes Introduced *[TASS]* 43
Renewed Violence Reported *[IZVESTIYA 9 Aug]* 43
Reports of 'Oppressing' of Uzbeks Prompt Protests *[TRUD 9 Aug]* 43
Tibilisi Investigators Find Army Acts 'Unlawful' *[TASS]* 44
Commission Meeting Noted *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 4 Jul]* 44
Tajikistan-Kirghizia Border Clashes Noted *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 18 Jul]* 45
Miners Strikes Attributed to Job Conditions *[TRUD 21 Jul]* 46
Estonian Supreme Soviet Adopts New Electoral Law *[Tallinn Radio]* 46
Further on New Law *[TASS]* 47
Estonian Deputies Protest Tiyt Made Article *[TASS]* 47
Tiyt Made Criticizes Gorbachev Leadership *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 14 Jul]* 47
Estonian Communist Party Official Interviewed *[RAHVA HAAL 1 Jul]* 49
Lithuanian Youths Attack Militia 25 Jun *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 29 Jun]* 51
U.S. Consul Visits Vilnius Newspaper *[KOMJAUNIMO TIESA 13 May]* 51
Latvian Draft Law on Demonstrations Issued *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 24 Jun]* 52
Conference Held on Nizhnyaya Kartli Situation *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 7 Jul]* 54
Formation of Georgian People's Front Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 54
Vlasov Addresses RSFSR Council of Ministers *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Aug]* 58
Kazakh Supreme Soviet Debates Discipline Problems *[IZVESTIYA 31 Jul]* 59
Crimean Tatars in Tajikistan Express Concerns *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 Jul]* 59
Zaykov Writes on Need for Unity in Perestroyka *[PRAVDA 9 Aug]* 60
Solovyev Reportedly Resigned '3 Months Ago' *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 19 Jul]* 64
Chebrikov, Lukyanov Attend Anti-Crime Meeting *[TASS]* 65
Bakatin on Militia, Crime Problems, Interpol Ties *[Moscow TV]* 65
Briefing Highlights Continued Crime Wave *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 8 Jul]* 66
Committee Protests 'Zionist's Union' *[TASS]* 66
Unofficial Workers Groups Meet *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 29]* 66
Rostov Party Leaders Meet With Informal Groups
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 25 Jul] 67
New Customs Regulations Take Effect 15 Aug *[PRAVDA 1 Aug]* 69
Individual Property Rights Clarified *[NEDELYA No 27]* 69
Goskompriroda Chief Explains Retirement *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Jul]* 71
Conference Discusses Nuclear Test Concerns *[KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 74
Nevada-Semipalatinsk Group's Statement Released *[TASS]* 74
Semipalatinsk Resident on Health Problems *[Moscow TV]* 74

Ecological Impact of Nuclear Test Site Examined *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jul]* 75
Causes, Consequences of 1957 Kyshtym Disaster *[IZVESTIYA 13 Jul]* 75
Nuclear Waste Burial in Krasnoyarsk Opposed
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 23 Jul] 77
Consolidation of Ideological Bodies Urged *[PRAVDA 19 Jul]* 78
Sverdlovsk Oblast Electoral Defeats Analyzed *[PRAVDA 14 Jul]* 80
Zalygin Gives Publishing Plans for Journal *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 12 Jul]* 84
Situation in Maritime Kray 'Serious' 85

Economic

Finance Minister Discusses Fiscal Problems *[TASS]* 86
Statistics Committee Chief Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 1 Aug]* 86
Aerospace Industry To Reconvert Capacities *[Moscow International]* 89

Agricultural

Help Requested for Ukraine Grain Harvest *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 15 Jul]* 89
Nikonov Visits Ukraine Fodder Research Center *[Moscow TV]* 90

Military

Belorussian Military Exercise Scheduled 15-22 Aug *[TASS]* 90
Ethnic Relations in Armed Forces Discussed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Aug]* 90

Bogachev Criticizes Bush's Fort Myer Speech
LD0808191189 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT 8 Aug 1845 GMT 89

["Bush's Speech in Virginia—TASS comment"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS—by TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

U.S. President George Bush said he intended to press for the passage of the full programme of modernizing American strategic forces and for the revision of Congress decisions which sharply curtailed the country's new draft defence budget, submitted by the Pentagon.

Speaking in Fort Myer, Virginia, on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the war department [as received], the President said that he will insist on deploying MX missiles on rail platforms, on completing the development of the new Midgetman ICBM and on "sufficient funding" for the B-2 Stealth bomber. the President again demanded "support for the Strategic Defense Initiative", i.e. the Star Wars programme.

The President's arguments in defense of his military programme are surprisingly similar to the rhetoric of his predecessor when he only began his activities at the White House. According to Bush, the build-up of the American strategic arsenal will "facilitate arms control", while SDI implementation will allegedly force "the Soviets to return to the negotiating table."

Not so long ago George Bush stated that he needed the new strategic weapons only as "a trump card" at the negotiations. Taking the White House reasoning on trust, one can arrive at a fantastic conclusion that 132 B-2 bombers, carrying the price tag of more than half a billion dollars each, will be deployed only to facilitate taking decisions at the negotiating table on their subsequent destruction, while the MX missile with 10 announce poker with aces. [sentence as received]

One would like to think that the President's phrase on "incentive for the Soviets to return to the negotiating table" got by accident into yesterday's speech from his speech of ten years ago. What disarmament talks is the Soviet Union refusing to attend now? What new negotiations on arms control is George Bush prepared to start? The President's speech in Virginia did not give answers to these questions.

An impression is produced that the build up of the U.S. military budget became a goal in itself for the White House, which becomes less and less related to the problem of ensuring security of the UNITED STATES and the military-political situation in the world. Strangely enough the U.S. Administration is confused even by Soviet initiatives on unilateral reduction of its armed forces for the only reason that they can prevent the Pentagon from pushing the military budget through the Congress.

Fourth Round of Nuclear Test Ban Talks Ends
LD0908094789 Moscow TASS in English 0938 GMT 9 Aug 89

[Text] Geneva August 9 TASS—A regular, fourth, round of the Soviet-American talks on limiting and ending nuclear tests has come to a close here.

During this round of the talks the delegations continued to elaborate a mechanism of control over the 1974 treaty on the limitation on underground tests of nuclear weapons.

Karpov Assesses Geneva Nuclear Arms Talks
LD0908113489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1004 GMT 9 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow, 3 August (TASS)—The round of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva which has just ended showed that the administration of U.S. President George Bush is on the whole ready to continue the talks on the basis laid down during the dialogue with the Ronald Reagan Administration, Viktor Karpov, deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs, said today.

"We feel that this is a positive factor which makes it possible, without dwelling on issues that have already been resolved, to continue the progress towards a treaty on strategic offensive weapons", he stressed in a conversation with TASS diplomatic correspondent Vadim Biryukov.

At the same time, the deputy minister noted the presence of serious differences between the sides. "There were no positive moves in the U.S. position on the implementation of the clauses of the ABM Treaty", he said. "Evidently, additional efforts are needed to achieve the implementation of the accord which was reached on this key issue in December 1987 during the visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to Washington".

Sea-launched cruise missiles remain a stumbling block, the Soviet diplomat said further. Hitherto, the American side has come out against the introduction of the agreed restrictions, proposing only an exchange of juridically nonbinding statements about plans to deploy cruise missiles of this kind. "The adoption of this proposal would signify that the American side would get the opportunity of deploying without restriction as many sea-launched cruise missiles it wishes," Viktor Karpov said.

As far as air-launched cruise missiles are concerned, differences continue to remain as to how to take stock of them—according to the actual rigging of a heavy bomber, or by setting an agreed number as the United States

proposes. Such a means of stock-taking, Viktor Karpov feels, "clearly pursues the goal of possessing air-launched cruise missiles above the permitted number".

The deputy minister drew attention to the problem of elaborating reliable methods for monitoring. "Experiments like those conducted by Soviet and American scientists in the Black Sea when they tested the possibility of discovering nuclear weapons at a distance with the help of instruments should be placed on an intergovernmental footing", he said. "The task is to consolidate a future treaty on strategic offensive weapons with reliable monitoring methods."

Responding to a question as to whether the sphere of nuclear and space weapons is a priority in the Soviet-American disarmament talks, Viktor Karpov noted: "I think that it is in the interests of the USSR and the United States to simultaneously seek mutually acceptable solutions that would lead to a reduction of troops and weapons, to a reduction of the nuclear burden, and to the elimination of chemical weapons. These are general human and equally important tasks that have to be resolved one way or another". The deputy minister feels that a treaty on strategic offensive weapons could be prepared over the course of 1 year, however, to achieve this, "the political will and the political resolve of both sides", are needed.

Status of Nuclear, Space Arms Talks Discussed

PM0808114989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent I. Melnikov dispatch: "At the Soviet-U.S. Talks in Geneva: Difficult and Crucial Stage"]

[Text] Geneva, 7 Aug—The latest round of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms has ended in Geneva. After almost 50 days of complex and occasionally dramatic dialogue, the sides have exchanged updated texts of the prepared documents. Then the delegation heads—ambassadors Yu. Nazarkin and R. Burt—held press conferences in response to keen interest from the journalists accredited to the Palais des Nations. The date of the next round is scheduled for September following a meeting between the USSR and U.S. foreign ministers.

The question of a 50-percent reduction in the Soviet and U.S. strategic offensive arms arsenals is still one of the important questions on the agenda of relations between both countries. Just our relations, moreover? Any state that has the interests of the world at heart cannot remain indifferent to the outcome of the Vienna talks—for the question of razing to the ground two vast mountains of nuclear weapons, which pose a danger to all mankind, is under discussion here.

Thus, the 11th round. What was it like and what did it produce? Might disarmament historians some day describe it as the most difficult yet at the same time a crucial round in the course of the Vienna talks? Suffice it to recall that the round of talks was preceded by a 7-month recess and began after a change of administration in the White House and the latter's well known "strategic review."

Yes, we were interested in the U.S. side preserving continuity. These joint drafts, which have been elaborated and may form the bones of a future treaty, could not be allowed to come to nothing. Fortunately, common sense won through. Work resumed in June on the basis of the texts which were left on the negotiating table on the day the 10th round ended. Subsequent events confirmed that the accords reached during the Washington and Moscow summits are still the point of departure for closing the gap between their positions.

However, further questing on this basis was difficult. Unfortunately, substantial progress was not made in Geneva on the main "stumbling block"—the need for observance of the ABM Treaty as signed in 1972 and nonwithdrawal from it for an agreed period.

The following picture is now taking shape. Deeming the linkage between strategic offensive arms reductions and limitations in ABM defense systems to be an objective one, the Soviet delegation proposed incorporating in the text of the treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms an article concerning the nonvalidity of the treaty in the event of the violation of the ABM Treaty. The U.S. delegation has rejected this proposal at present. A deadlock situation has arisen in terms of the resolution of the question of restricting the number of sea-launched long-range cruise missiles. The U.S. side asserts that nuclear sea-launched cruise missiles must be distinguished from nonnuclear missiles, but how can this be done? However, Soviet and U.S. scientists in the Black Sea have already tried out a long-range verification method, which enables the presence of nuclear weapons on ships to be determined.

I must say that in the verification sphere the Soviet side advocates the most [predelno] extensive monitoring of how the limitation or banning of all types of strategic offensive arms will be implemented. Verification promises to be very labor-intensive; however, as the saying goes, the game is worth the candle. Proceeding on this premise, our experts are attentively studying the U.S. proposal on verification measures, which must be prepared and implemented prior to the conclusion of a strategic offensive arms treaty. However, it is clear that the implementation of such measures must not impede the elaboration of a document and that both processes must proceed simultaneously. Since the time has now come when actions must complement good wishes.

Moscow-NATO TV Linkup Viewed

PM0408120189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Jul 89 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Observer Captain S. Sidorov under the rubric "Following After Event": "Moscow-Brussels Television Linkup"]

[Text] The Moscow-Brussels television linkup which connected "Studio 9" of the Ostankino television center with the NATO headquarters television studio and

which was shown on Central Television on Saturday evening [29 July], was new evidence of the trend toward constructive dialogue which has appeared in the past 12-18 months in relations between representatives of the armed forces belonging to opposite military-political alliances.

Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, adviser to the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman, who headed the USSR Armed Forces General Staff for several years, and General W. Altenburg, former Bundeswehr general inspector and now chairman of the NATO Military Committee, took part in the discussion, which proceeded in an atmosphere of good will not for all that devoid of acute moments. The high rank of those taking part in the television linkup in the military-political structures of the Warsaw Pact and NATO and the level of competence they demonstrated during the talk undoubtedly attracted the attention of the viewer seeking to gain a deeper understanding of the trends in the development of the military-political situation in the world and to obtain "first-hand" information.

As a result of the open comparison of viewpoints freely set forth by the participants in the dialogue, television viewers received rich food for thought and independent analysis. One of the most interesting episodes, in my view, was when Marsh S.F. Akhromeyev and General W. Altenburg compared the military doctrines of the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Here the NATO representative gave an account of how the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine is perceived in the West while S.F. Akhromeyev gave a reasoned formulation of the Warsaw Pact allies' concerns with regard to the "nuclear deterrent doctrine."

Television viewers probably noticed the insufficient consistency in some of General W. Altenburg's replies. For instance, in citing a number of what seemed to me weighty arguments against the Warsaw Pact's doctrine of "preperestroyka" times, General W. Altenburg was at the same time unable to convincingly counter the Soviet sides' arguments, which graphically showed the aggressive nature of some components of NATO doctrine. Primarily components like the "airland operation (battle) concept, the nuclear element of the "flexible response strategy," and the annual NATO troop and naval forces "Autumn Forge" exercises which are often of an unpredictable and even provocative nature.

The fact that these features blatantly do not accord with the new opportunities which have appeared in East-West relations, especially against the background of the unilateral disarmament initiatives taken by the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states obliged General W. Altenburg to admit that the Warsaw Pact's present doctrine is "more defensive" than the NATO doctrine.

Altenburg's statements drew attention to one more circumstance characteristic of the NATO position—the persistent reluctance to include the U.S. and NATO naval forces in the overall balance of forces in Europe ("it is difficult to compare tanks with aircraft carriers"). The motive for this argument is as a whole clear and it was revealed by Marshal Akhromeyev. If you do not engage in "counting out beans"—a tank for a tank, a gun for a gun—but compare the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact and NATO in terms of the combat potentials of all their components, including in terms of their naval forces, then the myth of Soviet military superiority is destroyed, with all ensuing consequences for the correctness of NATO nuclear strategy.

As was to be expected, to back up his position General W. Altenburg spoke of the "special" function of the U.S. and NATO naval forces. It is not without interest to recall that a former U.S. defense secretary, during a visit to the Soviet Union, said approximately the same thing in his speech to students of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff military academy. Answering a question about whether the U.S. naval forces threaten the Soviet Union, F. Carlucci said at the time: "No, we are threatening no one. The United States needs large navy and military bases not as a threat but to defend communications, trade, and commerce." But the White House 1987 report, prepared not without the participation of Carlucci himself, says the absolute opposite: "Supremacy at sea enables us to take advantage of the Soviet Union's geographical vulnerability and create a global threat to Soviet interests."

It is the present U.S. naval strategy, like the "airland battle" concept which completely contradicts the task of ensuring the stability of the balance between the Warsaw Pact and NATO while reducing the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe—the task put at the basis of the mandate of the Vienna talks. Analysis shows that as conventional armaments are reduced the naval forces will have increasingly influence on the balance of forces and create an atmosphere of destabilization unfavorable to the side with fewer naval forces.

It would nonetheless be wrong to believe that General W. Altenburg's position on a number of questions remained absolutely immobile. The advantage of constructive dialogue is that specific and convincing arguments require reciprocity from one's opponent. Thus, the NATO representative could not fail to agree with the expediency of holding consultations between Warsaw Pact and NATO naval experts.

Points of contact also emerged in the discussion between the two eminent military figures of the East and West. The most important was the desire to continue and to expand dialogue. In particular the Soviet side again proposed organizing meetings of the two military blocs' experts to examine specific issues of mutual interest.

The desire for dialogue, the desire and ability to hear and be heard demonstrated by the eminent military officials instill optimism. It is universally recognized that contacts between military leaders and experts on a permanent basis help to create an atmosphere of trust and of

better mutual understanding and through it the prerequisites for greater dynamism in bilateral and multilateral relations. And primarily in negotiation processes, on whose fruitfulness the security of the country and the welfare of our people depend directly or indirectly. After all, the military experts at the talks are assigned far from the last role in seeking mutually acceptable, balanced solutions.

The very fact of the "Studio 9" broadcast with the participation of major military specialists (the presenter was the political observer V. Zorin) reflects the growing interest which the Soviet public is displaying in military aspects of international problems and attests to the expanding understanding of their importance. It remains only for us to welcome the fact that East-West military contacts have been given a new measure of glasnost and to await new meetings with interesting interlocutors.

Risk Reduction Center Head Interviewed

PM0808142589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Aug 89 First Edition p 2

[Interview in Moscow with Major General V. Medvedev, chief of the USSR National Center for the Reduction of the Nuclear Danger, by Lieutenant Colonel N. Belan under the rubric "Declassified": "In the Name of Trust"; date of interview not specified; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Everything is quietly ticking over here—duty room, communications center, computers.... Major General V. Medvedev, chief of the USSR National Center for the Reduction of the Military Danger, showed me around his unique facility, a few minutes' walk from the Kremlin, in the General Staff building. The Americans have set up a similar center in Washington, on the seventh floor of the U.S. State Department. They are in contact around the clock.

[Belan] Vladimir Ivanovich, whose organs are these centers—ours and the American one? What is the logic behind their creation and operation?

[Medvedev] The centers are the result of the new political thinking. The agreement on setting them up was prepared and signed pretty quickly. The promptness indicates above all how convinced both sides, Soviet and American, were of the need for specific steps to reduce and ultimately eliminate the danger of a nuclear war.

At first the centers' functions were modest: informing each other about ICBM launches beyond national borders. Soon we started to give notice of all ICBM launches. Then came a new and considerable task—supplying information associated with the state of and changes in medium- and shorter-range missiles covered by the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles: what kind of missiles there are at particular bases, the coordinates of the bases, how many missiles and how many bunkers, transport facilities, and so on there are. The sides inform one another of the slightest changes. We also hand over information on any intention to carry out an inspection, on the members of the inspection group, on their arrival time....

So the centers are basically our governments' working instruments to monitor and implement the treaty on the intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

[Belan] Is there any difference between the structure of the Soviet center and that of the U.S. center?

[Medvedev] Practically none. But they do have their own special features. The U.S. center is not directly involved with inspections—there is a separate service to do this, led by Brigadier General R. Lajoie. Here the transfer of information and the inspections come under the same department. In our view, this structure is better as far as implementation of the treaty tasks is concerned, and the Americans have said the same.

[Belan] What kind of apparatus do you have, if it is not a secret?

[Medvedev] Several dozen people. Not counting the inspectors, there could be as many as 400 of them. In principle the Americans have a similar number. In both cases the inspectors are people who are enlisted to do these jobs and they have permanent jobs elsewhere. Most of them are military people.

[Belan] How do the centers keep in contact?

[Medvedev] I have to say that most of our contacts are with members of the U.S. inspection service. Practically every day we greet someone, see someone off, and organize inspections at facilities. As for the U.S. center, we communicate with it daily. According to the agreement, we have face-to-face contacts with its representatives at least once a year. We have not met yet this year. At last year's meeting the means of notification were refined—there are over 40.

[Belan] What kind of person does your center take on? On what principle was the current staff selected?

[Medvedev] First and foremost they are highly skilled specialists, mainly missilemen, with long service and life experience, such as, for example, Colonels V. Yevdokimov and G. Komogortsev. They are mainly senior officers. But there are young people too—translators. Senior Lieutenant M. Ufimtsev, for example, is only 27. And the average age of the center's personnel is a little over 40.

[Belan] Vladimir Ivanovich, how did you come to be at the center?

[Medvedev] Previously I worked at the General Staff. My final service years were closely associated with the negotiations and the elaboration of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles—I headed the group preparing the document. Obviously, when they appointed me they were aware that part of my service, after graduating from the F.E. Dzerzhinskiy Military Academy, had been associated with ranges, tests, and the introduction of new armaments into the forces. I have also worked in a scientific research institute.

[Belan] What does a Soviet inspector's job entail?

[Medvedev] He strictly abides by the provisions of the treaty and the protocol on inspections—they lay down the rights, duties, and procedures. The inspector arrives at the point of entry into the country (each has two: Moscow and Ulan-Ude here and Washington and San Francisco in the United States), where he is met by the U.S. officials who will accompany him. The inspector can stay, as a rule, no more than 24 hours. During that time he has to announce the site of the inspection—it is not announced in advance. Then the hosts have no more than 9 hours to get him to the requisite site. The inspection lasts for up to 24 hours. The inspector checks whether the facility has the number of weapons it is supposed to have and makes a report.

It is unusual work, and there is a great deal of interest in it. Indeed, can any of us Soviet military people have seen a secret U.S. base before? Now we are go there, beyond the barbed wire, and inspecting storage facilities, missiles, and the base territory. The same is allowed at our facilities.

[Belan] Have you been on a mission to the United States? What were your impressions?

[Medvedev] My impressions are of the elimination of missiles—in the United States and here. You get mixed feelings when you see missiles being burned, blown up, or cut up. Before our meeting I was in America, attending the destruction of the last, 169th Pershing-1A.... Weapons are being destroyed in which a great deal of labor and human thought has been invested. On the other hand, one is clearly aware that we are destroying them for a sacred, noble purpose. It is the old approaches to security problems and stereotyped ways of thinking that are, as it were, going up in flames and vanishing into nothingness.

[Belan] Vladimir Ivanovich, are you personally acquainted with the leaders of the U.S. center?

[Medvedev] Of course, I am. The chief of the center is David Svorts [surname as transliterated], a State Department staffer, whom I have met. Our contacts are businesslike, I am entirely satisfied with them, and I have never heard anything different from my American partners. We operate in a correct manner and neither side has any complaints. There are aspects, of course, that require further clarification. In the event of any complaints, there is a special monitoring commission that meets periodically in Geneva.

[Belan] How much does the widening of the functions and framework of your activity depend on the center's personnel?

[Medvedev] The framework of our operation is clearly defined and regulated in such detail that even its basic implementation requires a great deal of concentration and effort. But the creative principle is not relegated to a minor role in our work. Take the simplest example. A group of inspectors arrives at the point of entry, Moscow. It is our duty to get them to the inspection site, accommodate them, and make sure they can do their work properly. But what if the Americans express a wish to organize yet another, consecutive inspection? We will discuss it together and suggest how best to do it.

In the future, I think we will be faced with many new tasks with the signing of the treaty on the reduction of strategic armaments. Obviously, our centers will be involved in this process. But it is better that our workload should increase rather than, as was the case in the past, that of missile units' personnel, who had to contend with military confrontation.

[Belan] Tell me, has the likelihood of the button's being pressed diminished with the creation of the centers?

[Medvedev] There is no mathematically exact answer to that question, of course. You cannot express in figures and percentages the likelihood of the reduction of the threat of military danger. The important thing is that the world's political climate is changing and trust is strengthening. Our centers have a definite place in this process. For instance, what does information about ICBM launches do? It means that the opposing side no longer wonders: What kind of launch is it, what is its purpose? The tension in those "fingers on buttons" is relieved.

[Belan] The final question: Why does the center employ mainly military people?

[Medvedev] They are well acquainted with the technology, how it operates, and its potential. In the final analysis one must look at the issue in the following way: The center's activity is a new and unprecedented form of work for military people on averting the nuclear danger. In view of this task, we and missile units' officers are performing a common task—preventing a nuclear catastrophe and maintaining peace. What could be more important in our difficult times?

Petrovskiy on Proposal for UN Peace-Keeping Force
LD0808030889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1745 GMT 7 Aug 89

[Text] Vienna, 7 Aug (TASS)—At a press conference here today, V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, stated that we highly value the activity of the UN as a unique international center in the service of peace and security. We favor the search for new approaches, the rethinking of the place and role of the UN in solving the global problems facing mankind. He was taking part in the work of an international diplomatic seminar on the problems of UN peace-keeping operations.

The enhancement of the UN's role in contemporary conditions is indissolubly linked with the improvement of the international climate, with the influence of the new political thinking of international relations, the Soviet representative noted. The politics of the Soviet Union in the international arena proceeds from the need to bring relations between states into line with the realities of an interdependent world, to account for the interests of other states.

The USSR representative put forward a Soviet program for stepping up the activities of the UN, which mainly envisages the carrying out of measures to avert regional conflicts and crises, and the solution of all the tough questions by talks.

The Soviet Union wants to search harder for forms and methods of deciding on conducting operations and for improving the efficiency of implementing such decisions. The new Soviet proposals envisage the setting up of a system for forestalling crisis situations early on, for the organization, under the UN auspices, of an international center or a training program for military and civilian personnel for the UN forces, and also for UN forces to carry out operations in the sea lanes in order to ensure security of navigation.

He stressed the increasingly important role of neutral and nonaligned states in strengthening peace and security, constructing an all-European home, and their contribution, especially that of Austria, to the activity of UN troops in keeping peace in various regions.

Briefing Cites Contacts With U.S. on Afghanistan
PM0808102589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Aug 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Excerpt] At a regular briefing at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center on 3 August Soviet and foreign journalists were addressed by leading Foreign Ministry experts on the Afghan settlement and the banning of chemical weapons.

Those present were briefed, among other things, on the Soviet-American consultations on Afghanistan held in Stockholm. Despite the profound difference in assessments and approaches the consultations afforded an opportunity to evaluate each other's position and map out ways of rapprochement, particularly as there are aspects where mutual understanding has manifested itself. These concern, for example, the fate of Soviet POW's, Afghanistan's future as a peaceful, nonaligned country with an amicable attitude toward its neighbors, and the need to employ political methods to settle the situation. [passage omitted]

NATO's Woerner Speaks on East-West Relations
LD0708192589 Moscow TASS in English 1918 GMT 7 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 7 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

In the whole history of East-West relations there has never been a time when chances of improved relations between the two military and political alliances were better than those of a sharper confrontation. The idea expressed by Manfred Woerner, NATO's secretary-general, in his address to the opening congress of reserve officers of eleven countries of the North Atlantic alliance, reflects positive changes in the world which have, doubtlessly, been a direct result of the new political thinking.

NATO's political leader also noted the role of the "successful policy of the West" which have contributed to these changes. In the words of Manfred Woerner, NATO supports the Soviet policy of reforms since this leads to greater "openness of society, to the observance of human rights and pluralism".

What must be, in Manfred Woerner's opinion, NATO's course in the presentday conditions? Instead of a proposal—logical in this situation—to respond in kind to the positive changes now under way in the Warsaw Treat countries, Woerner called on the countries of the North Atlantic bloc to increase their defense capacity and to embark on new defense programs.

One is surprised by the arguments adduced by the ranking NATO official in his speech. According to him, the need to strengthen the West's defenses is dictated by a "lack of real disarmament steps on the part of the Soviet Union", which allegedly continues the production of combat equipment in an unchanged volume.

And what about the many practical steps of the USSR, such as the unilateral reduction in the armed forces by 500 thousand troops, the continued withdrawal of troops and materiel from some of the European socialist countries, and giving a defensive structure to the remaining troop? It is regrettable that these were left out of the logical construction contrived by the NATO official. It is

a pity that NATO's political leadership continues to lag behind in the elaboration of new approaches to solving major international problems.

The Soviet Union is convinced that it is impossible to clear the logjams amassed during the years of East-West confrontation if one relies on the instruments of the cold war times.

Brutents on Foreign Socialist, Communist Parties

18070719 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 30, 29 Jul-4 Aug 89 pp 4-5

[Interview with K.N. Brutents, first deputy manager of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee by P. Lukyanchenko, ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent: "Reappraisal of Values"]

[Text] [Lukyanchenko] Karen Nersesovich, there was a report in the press that you headed a CPSU delegation which participated in the work of the 18th Congress of the Socialist International in the status of an observer. In what connection was this done? Because it was not long ago that we said that workers in this organization were "opportunists" and "traitors to the interests of the working class," and the Sotsintern [Socialist International] itself was termed "yellow."

[Brutents] That is so, although it was not very recently. The relations between the communists and the social democrats went through various periods, including very critical ones. And both sides were to blame. But times change, situations change, and, people and leaders change. About in the middle of the 1970's, these relations began, if one can express it this way, to defrost. A real turning point occurred in the last several years.

Of course, not only our attitude toward the social democrats changed, but also their attitude towards us. I repeat that a key role was played here by the changing situation in the world, our changing policy, and the development of social democracy itself. So that, very likely, it is better not to poke one's nose into an analysis of history.

Now, with respect to the Stockholm congress itself. I will begin with the fact that this is the first time that CPSU representatives took part in this forum. This in itself says a lot.

The congress was not a usual one. It is not only that it was timed to coincide with the 100th anniversary of the Sotsintern and the 200th anniversary of the French Revolution: The congress adopted a new Declaration of Principles (program) of this organization. And it must be said that it differs advantageously from the Frankfurt declaration of 1951, because it does not carry the imprint of the "cold war."

There is one more distinctive feature of the congress: It was the most representative in the entire history of the Sotsintern; it convened delegates, guests, and observers from more than 100 parties, organizations, and movements. Of these, 27 parties—Sotsintern members—are ruling parties.

Approximately one-fourth of all current members of this organization—19 parties—are from Latin America. As was noted in Stockholm, mostly owing to this region (and also to a certain extent owing to other developing countries), the ranks of the Sotsintern have been growing in recent years. Apparently, because of the influence of this factor, it has turned to the problems of the third world in a noticeable way. It is significant that Ayala, a Chilean, became the new general secretary of the SI [Socialist International].

Willi Brandt, who enjoys great political and moral authority, was reelected again as chairman of the Sotsintern practically unanimously. As I understand, his activity in leading the Sotsintern has received widespread recognition, not to mention his past services in the struggle against Nazism and as the leader of such a major social democratic party as the SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany (FRG)]. The name of Brandt is also associated with the "Eastern policy," and Eastern agreements have served as a keystone for many salutary changes in Europe. I would especially like to note that, from the rostrum of the congress, Brandt welcomed observers from the Soviet Union who, as he said, "are people who with M.S. Gorbachev are working on the problems of perestroyka."

[Lukyanchenko] Yes, but, at the same time, he is well-known as an adversary of communism. In particular, Brandt was the co-author of the regrettable notorious law "Concerning the Ban on Professions," on the basis of which barefaced discrimination is carried out against West German communists.

[Brutents] It is more accurate to say that while he was chancellor in 1971 he supported a joint decision of the prime ministers of the lands of the FRG. But since the middle of the 1970's, the SPD began to distance itself from this decision and, in the lands that were managed by the social democrats, it lost its practical effect.

[Lukyanchenko] Can one say that today the social democratic ideology is the most influential among the West German population?

[Brutents] It is difficult to answer simply. At least, the recent elections in the European Parliament can be interpreted to mean that the relative balance in the last 3 years between the political influence of neoconservatism and social democracy is changing in favor of the latter. The rollback of the neoconservative wave, which revealed the unresolved and rather aggravated problems of capitalism, moved the social democrats not only to

sharpen criticism of neoconservativism and the postulates of the "free market," but also to come out more resolutely in the defense of social justice, and to speak more constructively about socialism.

[Lukyanchenko] In making contacts with us, are not the social democrats thereby coming to an ideological compromise with us?

[Brutents] No, there is no compromise in this. There is a respect for reality and an understanding that our perestroyka is changing and normalizing the international climate in a fundamental way. The congress showed the exceptional interest of social democracy in perestroyka in the USSR and reforms in other socialist countries. There were impressive statements, for example, by English laborite leader Kinnock; by Bar, one of the leading SPD workers; Sorsa, the chairman of the parliament of Finland, and by others, that social democracy, in the current critical transition period, must give perestroyka active support, first and foremost, by promoting disarmament and thereby freeing up resources for civilian purposes.

[Lukyanchenko] A point of view exists that, before perestroyka, our country was actually an impediment to progressive transformations in the world.

[Brutents] In any case, it did not serve as an inspiring example for leftist forces during the period of stagnation, and in this sense it did not contribute to their reinforcement. At last, perestroyka is uniting the concepts of socialism and democracy in the eyes of the whole world.

[Lukyanchenko] You are speaking of "socialism with a human face."

[Brutents] Call it what you wish, although I would not use terminology over which swords have been crossed at one time or another.

I would like to return to the question of whether the social democrats, as you put it, have moved toward an "ideological compromise."

It seems that this problem has to be approached in a different way—first of all in a political perspective. And here there are many points of contact. For example, the platform adopted in Stockholm on questions of peace, disarmament, and security—and these questions were in the foreground in the work of the congress—are very close to ours, if not even more. There is also a lot of commonality in problems that concern the North and the South and in ecology, which was also given paramount attention. Incidentally, the leader of the Danish social democrats, Auken, introduced an interesting proposal on the creation of an international council of security and ecology patterned after the Security Council.

In addition, we are interested in the study of the experience of the social democrats, for example, in the sphere of regulating market relations, social policy, the cooperative movement, municipal management, parliamentary democracy, etc. In turn, the social democrats are showing a considerable interest in our ongoing political reform and reorganization in the sphere of economics, especially concerning problems, if one can express it this way, of the social regulation of the market.

[Lukyanchenko] But are the social democrats that unselfish in their support of perestroyka?

[Brutents] If you look at things soberly then, of course, they are counting on strengthening their influence in the region of Eastern Europe. I would not be completely honest if I did not say, that by no means are all social democrats inclined to loyal cooperation. Unfortunately, some of them are not, and they reveal themselves in regurgitations of a confrontational approach that are mixed up with phrases about "the crash of communism."

[Lukyanchenko] In such a case, how do you evaluate the statement of A. Occhetto, the general secetary of the Italian Communist Party, who, at the beginning of June in an interview with the newspaper CORRIERE DELLA SERA, said: "In the countries of the Eastern Bloc, communism has become a term that has lost all connection with its own historical origins.... These are regimes that are headed for a catastrophe.... Of course, Gorbachev's struggle or Yeltsin's struggle are tied to socialist ideals. But, in my opinion, absolutely nothing is left of communism as a system that laid claims to unity and integrity.... We (the Italian Communist Party—Editor) are not a component part of the communist movement. We no longer belong to that camp?"

[Brutents] I think that the question is actually about the crisis of the command-administrative system. It has different manifestations in different countries. I can declare very definitely that the Italian communists unequivocally, I would even say as fans, enthusiastically support our perestroyka, about which Comrade Occhetto [Italian Communist Party Head] spoke in a meeting with M.S. Gorbachev in February of this year. This is also known from the daily contacts with the Italian comrades. You see, they understand clearly how the fate of world socialism hangs on the fate of our perestroyka.

As for the statements that the IKP [Italian Communist Party] is not a part of the international communist movement, that is really its position, which, however, was not just taken today. As to why the statement was made, the Italian communists themselves could best answer this.

[Lukyanchenko] Not long ago we proclaimed the noninterference of communist parties in each other's affairs. How then should we consider our actions with respect to the Spanish Communist Party? It has become known

that in July of last year during a meeting with J. Anguita, the general secretary of the Communist Party of Spain, we brought pressure to bear so that the communists of Spain would unite. In January of this year, the unification took place.

[Brutents] You say "it became known." But it is really difficult for me to imagine the source of such inaccurate information. If you are talking about the essence of the matter, of course, there was nothing of the kind. The CPSU not only declares, but it also adheres very scrupulously to the principles of the equality and independence of parties and noninterference in their internal affairs—principles that were confirmed and emphasized with great force at the 27th Congress. Moreover, we do not deviate from these principles even when—and this sometimes still happens—we are asked to interfere.

[Lukyanchenko] The Western press sometimes carries articles which indicate that we give material help, and sometimes very significant help, to communist parties of other countries. In particular, at the end of January in 1980, V.N. Sofinskiy, USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to New Zealand, was expelled from that country on charges of interfering in the internal affairs and financing the preelection campaign of New Zealand communists.

[Brutents] But you forgot to add that these charges were officially rejected by the Soviet side. Foreign communist parties live and work on their own resources. I do not want to say by this that the mutual relations between parties fully correspond in ideological and political aspects. The parties, for example, are given support, let us say, in the form of receiving their activists and leadership representatives for studies, rest, and medical treatment. By the way, this is also done with respect to relations with national progressive and social democratic parties. Rest is usually combined with familiarization with our life, with conversations in party organizations, and with visits to enterprises and kolkhozes [collective farms]. So that this is yet another avenue for a mutual exchange of experience. Indeed, in general this is normal practice for almost any party, and for any trade union.

[Lukyanchenko] One can frequently see reports in the press that a Soviet delegation has left for one or another country for an exchange of experience. The readers say that these are nothing more than tourist trips under the cover of and at the expense of the party.

[Brutents] Again this is far from the truth. Of course, the effectiveness of different delegations varies. Some are more qualified and make contacts easily, and others are not as effective. But I must tell you from my personal experience, trips of this kind, as a rule, mean intensive work: endless meetings, conversations, discussions, and speeches.

[Lukyachenko] Karen Nersesovich, what is your salary?

[Brutents] I get R550 per month.

[Lukyanchenko] Does the international department of the CPSU Central Committee have its own rest homes and sanatoriums abroad?

[Brutents] No, we do not have anything like that, and we never had anything like that.

[Lukyanchenko] Joint enterprises are appearing everywhere now. Does the CPSU Central Committee have any kind of a joint enterprise with foreign communist parties?

[Brutents] We really do have a joint enterprise, and not with just one, but with many and, moreover, with different parties. It is called, "democracy, social progress, and socialism." But this enterprise, as you know, has been in existence for a number of years.

War Veterans Discuss Disarmament at Conference

PM0808131789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS correspondent report: "Veterans' Meeting"]

[Text] Leningrad, 28 Jul—A session of the coordinating committee on disarmament of four authoritative international veterans' organizations has ended. The meeting was organized by the Soviet War Veterans Committee.

"Emissaries from almost 30 countries came to the city on the Neva to participate in the session," Hero of the Soviet Union Marshal of Aviation A.P. Silantyev, chairman of the Soviet War Veterans Committee, said. "We discussed problems of disarmament and of strengthening confidence-and security-building measures and many other questions."

Ecological Group Meets to Discuss Baltic Sea

LD0308200189 Moscow TASS in English 1617 GMT 3 Aug 89

[Text] Leningrad August 3 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Rachko:

Members of the international ecological action mottoed "For Culture, Ecology and Peace" have met here today. They included representatives of the USSR, Poland, Sweden and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Scientists and specialists, representatives of public ecological organisations from the above countries will spend four days discussing prospects for cooperation in the effort to save the Baltic Sea from further pollution.

They will proceed from Leningrad in 15 yachts to Stockholm and will then visit Gdansk and Kiel. The ecological action will end in the port of Hamburg.

"Sea bottom deserts, dying fish and hundreds of kilometers of beaches unfit for bathing—all this proves patently that the Baltic sea is ailing", a TASS correspondent was

told by Justus von Wiedekind, a Munich economist, coordinator of the international programme "Clean Baltic Sea". The governments of Baltic nations are unable to stop the spreading of pollution separately. This is why all Europeans must pool their efforts to save our common property. This will be an important step towards the development of cooperation in ecology between the east and the West".

Aeroflot Becomes Member of IATA

PM0408124589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent V. Belikov report under the "Fact and Commentary" rubric: "Aeroflot Joins IATA"]

[Text] The official ceremony marking the Soviet airline's affiliation to IATA [International Air Transport Association] has taken place at that authoritative nongovernmental organization's Geneva headquarters.

IATA has now been in existence 70 years, since the time when commercial companies flying passengers and freight were formed. After returning to Moscow on the evening of 24 July, First Deputy Minister of Civil Aviation B. Panyukov told your IZVESTIYA correspondent the following:

[Panyukov] The significance of our joining the association was succinctly and accurately defined by its general director, Doctor G. Eizer [name as transliterated], at the official ceremony: "IATA was not truly universal without the involvement of the world's largest airline—Aeroflot." The assessment and response voiced by many leading Western mass media have been similar.

In fact the association, which now unites 187 of the world's air transport enterprises, is concerned with flight safety and the choice of optimum international routes, sets transport operation efficiency standards, and works out uniform tariffs. Much attention is paid to the quality of passenger service and to introducing the latest computer systems into the processes of seat reservation and freight delivery planning.

[Belikov] The spheres of IATA's activity mentioned by you represent the everyday problems of our air enterprises....

[Panyukov] Being henceforth members of the association, we hope to make extensive use of IATA's great accumulated wealth of experience, its recommendations, business information, and databases to solve many of our own problems. At the same time we will actively seek with our partners the most sucessful ways of overcoming the difficulties common to all the world's airlines. For example, accidents, hijacking, and so forth. [Panyukov ends]

The conversation was continued by B. Ryzhenkov, the second participant in the trip to Geneva and executive secretary of the USSR ICAO [International Civil Aviation Organization] Commission:

[Ryzhenkov] IATA is a commercial organization and its annual budget is $20 million more than the resources at the ICAO's disposal. In addition to prestige, membership of the association is also particularly useful from the standpoint of enhancing Aeroflot's competitiveness on foreign routes. And this is particularly necessary when you bear in mind that in terms of international transportation we do not, unfortunately, figure in the top 10 countries.

Our membership of IATA will, in particular, afford us the opportunity to utilize an extensive air ticket retail sales network comprising more than 50,000 travel agencies worldwide. The effective measures being taken by the association to reduce the taxes and charges levied on airlines for various kinds of services at airports and on other matters are another advantage.

United States & Canada

U.S. 'Aircraft Carrier Diplomacy' Viewed

LD0808204289 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1330 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Excerpts] A squadron of U.S. warships composed of the cruiser Thomas S. Gates and the frigate Kauffman paid a visit to the city of Sevastopol in the Crimea, the location of the Soviet base of the Black Sea defense fleet. [passage omitted]

It is impossible not to express satisfaction with the peace mission of the U.S. seamen to Sevastopol, as it aims at improving the international political atmosphere. With all this, however, a worrying idea emerges: Did the U.S. ships, after the end of their visit to Sevastopol, not join the U.S. Naval war fleet, massed off the Lebanese shores? The Black Sea basin immediately adjoins the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea, where tension has acutely increased as a result of the Israeli commandoes' operation, the kidnapping of the Shi'a Shaykh 'Abd al-Karim 'Ubayd and the execution by terrorists of the U.S. hostage in Lebanon, Lieutenant Colonel william Higgins. The massing of 46 U.S. warships there shows the intentions of the U.S. Administration to respond to the complex situation by the traditional ways, i.e., by aircraft carrier diplomacy.

The U.S. media do not rule out that the Pentagon can use its fleet to hit the Lebanese al-Biqa' Valley and Iran's Khark Island, the largest oil terminal in the region. The planning of these military actions is taking place on the basis of the simple suggestion that the Shi'a organization Hizballah, whose fighters kidnapped the U.S. hostages, come under the influence of the Iranian leadership. We imagine this reaction to the hostage crisis from Washington to be disproportionate.

Naturally, it is possible to understand the feelings of the anxious and upset Americans as a result of their citizens' kidnapping by terrorists. However, as experience shows, betting on force can only increase the bloodshed and destruction. Washington should not omit from is calculations that the new upsurge of the crisis was provoked by Israel and that Washington has enough factors to force the Israeli leadership to act in a civilized way. Washington should consider UN mediation and note of a number of states, particularly Algeria and Iran, must not be scorned.

It seems to us this road will bring about greater prospects, which are a cause of satisfaction as a solution to the issue of freeing the hostages, or to improve U.S. relations with the Arab countries and Iran. This road will lead to a general improvement of the Middle East situation. The diplomacy of peace is regrettably still side by side with the policy of the aircraft carriers. We wish that the feelings of peace and expectation, which were brought about by the mission of the U.S. fleet in Sevastopol would not be spoiled by punitive actions in the eastern Mediterranean or the Persian Gulf and we are hopeful that the sound mind will triumph at the end.

Reportage on U.S. Navy Visit to Sevastopol

More on Sevastopol Welcome

PM0808130989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Aug 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "U.S. Ships' Visit"]

[Text] Sevastopol, 4 Aug—The shore battery of the Black Sea Fleet's main base greeted with the traditional Salute of Nations the detachment of U.S. warships comprising the cruiser "Thomas S. Gates" and the frigate "Kauffman" which has come here on an official visit under the flag of Vice Admiral R. Paul Ilg, deputy commander in chief of the U.S. Navy in Europe. These warships, on board which are approximately 600 seamen and officers, have come to the Soviet Black Sea port in response to the 21-25 July official visit by a detachment of Soviet warships to the U.S. port and naval base of Norfolk. The third declared participant in the visit—the cruiser "Belknap" under the flag of Vice Admiral James D. Williams, commander of the U.S. Navy's 6th Fleet—has remained in the Mediterranean in connection with the changed situation.

Soviet and foreign journalists went on board the cruiser "Thomas S. Gates" 12 miles from Sevastopol to greet it together with officials.

"Our visit to the Soviet Union," Vice Adm R. Paul Ilg told the TASS correspondent, "will undoubtedly provide further proof of the improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations and be one more step on the way to establishing stable and businesslike relations between our countries in the military sphere too."

The voyage commander paid protocol calls on the commander of the Black Sea Fleet and the chairman of Sevastopol City Soviet Executive Committee [gorispolkom]. Return visits were made.

A reception was held at Sevastopol Gorispolkom [City Soviet Executive Committee] for the U.S. officials who have come to the hero-city.

J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, participated in the welcoming ceremony.

On the same day Vice Adm R. Paul Ilg gave a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists. J. Matlock participated.

U.S. Naval Squadron Ends Visit

LD0808090189 Moscow TASS in English 0849 GMT 08 Aug 89

[Text] Sevastopol August 8 TASS—By TASS special correspondents Oleg Moskovskiy and Mikhail Stetsyuk:

The U.S. naval squadron consisting of the cruiser Thomas S. Gates and the frigate Kauffman under the flag of vice-admiral Paul Ilg, deputy commander-in-chief of the U.S. Navy in Europe, completed its official friendly visit here on Tuesday.

During their five-day visit, the American navymen familiarised themselves with the life and combat training of their Soviet counterparts, met with Sevastopol work collectives and toured historical and cultural landmarks.

"Our visit to Sevastopol became the most marked event of all the latest visits. People's interest in the United States of America and the famous Russian hospitality—all won the hearts of our sailors. Everything was okay," Vice Admiral Ilg said in a farewell speech.

The opinion of Admiral Mikhail Khronopulo, commander of the Black Sea Fleet, is that "the American naval squadron's visit to Sevastopol is another illustration of the building of trust and the development of cooperation between our two countries, peoples and the armed forces."

U.S. Navy Official Praises Visit

LD0808142189 Moscow TASS in English 1409 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Sevastopol August 8 TASS—The official visit of the U.S. naval squadron under the command of Vice-Admiral Richard Paul Ilg, deputy commander-in-chief of the U.S. Navy in Europe, to the main base of the Soviet Black Sea fleet is over.

The cruiser Thomas S. Gates and the frigate Kauffman on Tuesday set out from here, heading for the open sea.

Before departure, Vice Admiral Ilg was interviewed by TASS.

Questioned about his impressions of the visit to Sevastopol, the American vice admiral said:

Sevastopol is a wonderful city. We were given a cordial welcome by officials and ordinary people. We could not imagine that the welcome would be so hearty. When I first saw crowds of people who gathered on the landing stage and seamen lined up on the decks of ships I realised that it would be a special visit.

Vice-Admiral Ilg extressed gratitude to Admiral Mikhail Khronopulo, commander of the Black Sea fleet, the officers of the naval headquarters, the mayor of the city and all Sevastopol residents for making the visit unforgettable.

It is known, TASS asked, that the Sixth Fleet is based 700 miles away from the Soviet Union and 6,000 miles away from the United States. Does not it seem to you that the fact illustrates not quite a defensive mission?

Vice-Admiral Ilg: The presence of the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean illustrates the cultural and trade links which historically developed between the United States and Europe and ensure its security. We are deeply convinced that the seas will be free to navigate regardless of whether the Sixth Fleet is presented there.

It is very important for us that the world ocean be open to navigation for all countries, since we border only on two countries on land and consider ourselves an island country, he said.

Sea lanes not only closely link the United States and NATO in the field of trade but also contribute to strengthening the might of our allies. The presence of the U.S. 6th fleet in the Mediterranean in peace time shows the political will of our NATO allies and resists international terrorism, Vice Admiral Ilg said.

Meetings with all officials both military and civilian led to positive results, since we got an idea of each other. This fact illustrates the establishment of a new relationship between our two countries and their armed forces.

It seems to me that our relations from now on should be based on mutual respect and growing trust. This can be achieved only through frank and constructive dialogue. This also equally applies to our sailors. When meeting Soviet people they were able to get to know their aspirations and hopes and to see that Russians are hospitable and friendly people. These were highly useful contacts, Ilg said.

Black Sea Commander on Visit

LD0808205689 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Sevastopol August 8 TASS—By TASS special correspondents Oleg Moskovskiy and Mikhail Stetsyuk:

The official friendly visit by a group of U.S. navy ships comprising the Cruiser Thomas S. Gates and the Frigate Kauffman under the flag of vice-Admiral Paul Ilg, deputy commander-in-chief of the U.S. Navy in Europe, is over today. During the five-day visit American seamen familiarised themselves with the life and combat training of their Soviet counterparts, toured the plants of Sevastopol and its historical and cultural monuments.

"The visit to Sevastopol was the most remarkable of all of our latest visits. Interest in the United States of America, famous Russian hospitality—all this conquered the hearts of our seamen," Ilg said during the farewell ceremony.

Here is the view of Admiral Mikhail Khronopulo, commander of the Black Sea Fleet: "The visit of American sailors to Sevastopol demonstrates anew that the bonds of friendship and trust, of cooperation between our countries, peoples and armed forces are being strengthened".

Bush Repeats 'Peace Through Strength' Call

LD0708220889 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 7 Aug 89

[Text] President Bush has renewed his call for modernizing his country's strategic arms. He spoke on Monday at a ceremony marking 200 years of the American Defense Department. He reiterated his statement of peace through strength and called for Congressional approval of the administration's request for appropriations to redeploy MX long-range missiles from silos onto railway platforms, as well as the research and development into the Midgetman missile and Stealth bomber aircraft, invisible to radar. Mr Bush insisted that research into the SDI program be continued.

Reportage on U.S. Armed Services Delegation Visit

U.S. Delegation Arrives

LD0808110189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1847 GMT 7 Aug 89

[Excerpts] Moscow, 7 Aug (TASS)—"We want to cooperate with the newly created Committee on Issues of Defense and State Security of the Soviet parliament," Les Aspin (Democrat, Winsconsin State), chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, stated here. He heads a delegation from this committee which arrived in the Soviet Union today at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

"We have already had contacts with members of your parliament: Just recently we received Marshal Akhromeyev, adviser to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and we hope that the forthcoming dialogue with Soviet legislators will be no less fruitful," Les Aspin said in an interview with a TASS correspondent. "Also we can hardly wait to see military installations belonging to the Soviet Armed Forces." [passage omitted]

The U.S. delegation has 50 members including 14 members of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, congressmen's aides, and government and private experts on military matters.

Delegation Meets With Akhromeyev

LD0808145389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1307 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow, 9 Aug (TASS)—The joint search for constructive decisions on the further reduction of nuclear and conventional weapons was the main topic of a conversation held here today between a delegation of the U.S. Congress House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, led by its chairman, Les Aspin, and members of the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet on defense and state security and international affairs. The guests arrived here on Monday [7 August] at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Members of the U.S. delegation were interested in Soviet parliamentarians' involvement in compiling the USSR state budget, and above all the clauses on military expenditures for next year.

Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akromeyev, adviser to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, stated at the meeting that if agreements are signed on reducing conventional forces and weapons in Europe and if a Soviet-U.S. treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons is concluded, then by 1995, the USSR intends to roughly reduce its military expenditures by half.

Members of the committee on defense and state security explained the meaning of practical actions taken by the Soviet side in implementing the unilateral reduction of Soviet armed forces. Sergey Rogov, chairman of the public group which monitors the implementation of these steps and one of the leading specialists of the USSR Academy of Sciences U.S. and Canada Institute addressed the guests. He acquainted them with the latest data on the progress made in reducing the Soviet armed forces, including the withdrawal of troops from Mongolia and the GDR.

"We are satisfied with the first meeting with the American parliamentarians," Vladimir Lapygin, chairman of the committee on defense and state security, told a TASS correspondent. "Not a bad foundation has been laid for the further development of mutual understanding between the legislators of the two countries on problems on disarmament."

Karpov Receives U.S. Congressmen

LD0808175289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1547 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow, 8 Aug (TASS)—USSR Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Viktor Karpov met here today with a delegation from the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. Congress House of Representatives, headed by its chairman Les Aspin. The U.S. delegation is in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

During the meeting, which took place in a frank and amicable atmosphere, a detailed conversation was held on strengthening strategic stability and reducing the level of military confrontation between the USSR and the United States. The sides emphasized the need for an active quest for ways to strengthen the climate of trust on military-political questions.

The U.S. congressmen were given explanations to the questions they put about specific problems which were discussed at the nuclear and space armaments talks, as well as at the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe.

"It is precisely such a free exchange of opinions," said Viktor Karpov in an interview with a TASS diplomatic correspondent, "which provides an opportunity to sense the pulse of the life of the parliaments of our two countries, the mood of the legislators themselves and—this is the main thing—enables the trends of future cooperation to be determined."

V.F. Petrovskiy Receives TIME's Chief Editor

PM0908103189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Aug 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, has met with G. Miller, editor in chief of TIME magazine, who is visiting the Soviet Union. In the course of the conversation they discussed a broad range of questions relating to the progress of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, the introduction of the new political thinking in international politics, and the broadening of information cooperation between the USSR and the United States.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Crewmen From Sinking Soviet Tanker Missing

OW0808020989 Tokyo KYODO in English 0154 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Manila, Aug 8 KYODO—Sixteen crewmen are still missing from a Soviet oil tanker now feared to have sunk in the South China Sea west of the northern Philippine island of Luzon, rescue authorities said Tuesday.

Jose Reyes, a supervisor of the Manila Rescue Coordinating Center, said the tanker, the "Vishru," was reported to be in distress, leaking and listing about 240 kilometers west of Luzon on Sunday.

Reyes said the center was informed by the Western Pacific Rescue Coordination Center in Kadena, Japan, that another Soviet ship rescued 12 crewmen from the tanker but 16 others were still missing.

He said the second ship carrying the rescued crewmen was reported to be headed for Vietnam.

Bob Coble, assistant public affairs officer at the U.S. Subic Naval Base west of Manila, said a U.S. Navy plane failed to find the ship or survivors.

He said the P-3 Orion aircraft left Subic at 5:30 p.m. Monday to search the area where the ship was reported in trouble and returned at 2:40 a.m. Tuesday after finding only debris and an oil slick.

Analyst Views Paris Conference Outcome

LD0808192989 Moscow TASS in English 1847 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS—By TASS political analyst Sergey Afonin:

A U.N. fact-finding group arrived in Phnomh Penh in line with a decision taken by the International Paris Conference on Cambodia and a recommendation by the U.N. secretary-general. Its aim is to collect information necessary for further work of the conference and, above all, for setting up an international mechanism for control and observation over the withdrawal of foreign troops and implementation of understandings on Kampuchean settlement.

Documents on Cambodia which are being drafted now, will be based on ideas expressed at the conference. These ideas amplify the understandings reached at the Jakarta Informal Meetings and talks between Hun Sen, chairman of the Cambodian Council of Ministers, and Prince Narodom Sihanouk. The essence of these documents is to link the withdrawal of Vietnamese volunteer troops, which will be completed by September 26, and prevention of the Pol Pot regime from returning to power.

The Khmer Rouge came to the Paris conference full of unbounded ambitions. They tried to thwart the adoption of some decisions in the first days. But this tactics ended in a flop, and they were forced to beat a retreat. But how will the Khmer Rouge act in future?

Some questions should be settled without any delay. These are a ceasefire and establishment of a temporary institute of national concord for a transition period, including general, free and democratic elections. The State of Camodia proposed preservation for this period of the political and military status-quo and holding of elections under the guidance of a supreme governing council which could be formed by representatives of the Cambodian parties and of an international mechanism of control and observation. Countries participating in the conference took an obligation to respect the results of coming elections in the country. The conference came to understanding that Cambodia's domestic problems should be settled by Cambodians themselves in the spirit of national reconciliation and without outside interference.

The Paris conference helped bring much closer positions of various countries on Cambodia. If Cambodians are able to find a proper compromise, this will give a real

chance for an overall settlen ent of the regional conflict. It is important to ensure the interests of the Cambodian people and guarantee indep ndence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and neutrality of Cambodia.

'First Phase' of Paris Cambodia Talks Assessed

BK0908101389 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Station observer Viktor Valentinov's commentary]

[Text] The international conference on Cambodia is continuing its work in Paris. The first phase of the conference has already ended. The work of the conference is being carried out by various committees in charge of discussing the various aspects of the Cambodian solution.

Our observer, Viktor Valentinov, comments as follows:

After the international conference in Paris, while the special committees continued their work, the Cambodian problem was being discussed in Brunei where ASEAN heads of state held an informal meeting. There, they did not focus their attentions on the complex Cambodian problem itself. They discussed the outcome of the work achieved during the first phase of the Paris conference.

In his statement made after the end of the meeting, Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad said, among other things: We are a little bit disappointed. Realists that we are, we realize that this is not a problem which can be settled easily.

In my opinion, many people have had similar reactions. Previously, many thought that the delegations to the Paris conference would take only a few days to immediately and definitively settle this most acute problem which has perturbed the political life in Southeast Asia for more than 10 years in the past. Once in Paris, to the disappointment of many delegations, the process to settle the conflict was deadlocked due to unexpected difficulties. Unfortunately such things could not be avoided.

If one can still remember, the results of the dialogues between Cambodian factions held in past years were always unpredictable: Sometimes there was progress, at other times there were hitches. Sometimes the participants reached agreements as if there were no obstacles at all. For instance, as a result of the first informal meeting in Jakarta, a formula for the solution was reached. Soon afterwards, however, the Khmer Rouge turned its back on this agreement, thus compelling Comrade Prime Minister Hun Sen and Samdech Sihanouk to start anew. In Paris, too, the Khmer Rouge's Khieu Samphan backed off from many unexpected issues.

In this connection, I would like to refer to the decision to dispatch a special UN mission to Cambodia. The conference has assigned this mission with the task of gathering information on the situation in Cambodia, particularly in the western regions adjacent to the Thai border. While all other delegations endorsed this idea, Khieu Samphan surprisingly voiced his opposition. His pretext was that Khmer Rouge forces are scattered in all corners of the country and it would be difficult to travel to these areas. This issue had to be settled through a consensus, but because of the one dissenting voice, no resolution was adopted.

At this point, the rest of the conference would have been soured since the future work in Paris hinged upon the UN mission. A period of stalemate took place at the conference. Only after the Chinese and French foreign ministers used all their influence, could they persuade Khieu Samphan to change his mind.

This time they succeeded in persuading him, but who knows if the same situation will recur since the issues under discussion are so complex and multifaceted. There will certainly be conflicts of interests and frictions among the warring Cambodian forces.

In such a situation, what is important is that one must not become overly alarmed or lose one's perspective. More importantly, one must know how to work with patience in such a situation.

In my opinion, the leaders of the six ASEAN countries are capable of doing this job. The realistic attitude displayed by Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad in his statement has brought us hope. As he has said, people cannot solve problems by just sitting around a table. They must work patiently and strive to overcome one obstacle after another. They must know when to make concessions and how to bring their positions closer together. This is because the goal of the conference is immense: peace for the war-weary and devastated Cambodia and peace for all of Southeast Asia.

UN Asked To Drop Khmer Coalition Recognition

BK0908045589 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Twelve Nobel Prize laureates have appealed to the United Nations to withdraw international recognition for the opposing Cambodian parties. In an appeal to the United Nations, the laureates said that in the future UN National Assembly, Cambodia should no longer be represented by the so-called Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea, in which Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge group is the strongest member.

The ringleaders of the Pol Pot regime, who are guilty of killing hundreds of thousands of Cambodians in the period from 1975 to 1979, must be tried by an international tribunal for their genocidal crimes—crimes which have caused great hatred throughout the world. Although

the Khmer Rouge have tried to hide their faces behind the so-called coalition government led by Samdech Sihanouk, their true nature has not changed.

In their appeal, the twelve Nobel Prize laureates said the Cambodian seat at the United Nations should be given to the Cambodian government that will emerge from the general elections to be held in Cambodia under international supervision, as agreed upon by the UN secretary general and the four Cambodian factions.

Malaysian Ambassador Presents Credentials 7 Aug
BK0808140689 Moscow in Malay to Malaysia 1200 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Mr Mohamed Harun, Malaysian ambassador to the Soviet Union, presented his credentials to Anatoliy Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, at the Kremlin last night.

Mr Mohamed Harun highly appreciated the Soviet foreign policy and noted that historical events which will greatly influence the life of the modern world are taking place in the USSR. Openness and political and economic democratization as well as the new Soviet policy signal a change which is clearly seen by an amazed and hopeful world, the Malaysian ambassador said.

According to him, new developments in international affairs have made it possible for countries in the world to uphold the principles of strong peace and prosperity worldwide, including the Asia-Pacific region.

Receiving the credentials on behalf of the presidium and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Mr Lukyanov emphasized the close links between perestroika or the restructuring of Soviet society and the objective of ensuring a more peaceful and prosperous future for the Soviet Union and all mankind.

Touching on positive trends in developments taking place in the Asia-Pacific region, Mr Lukyanov affirmed the USSR's commitment to the policies announced in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarks, which aim at strengthening peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region and ensuring mutually beneficial and equal cooperation. These policies also aim at conducting broad dialogue on all related issues with all countries concerned, including the ASEAN countries.

Mr Lukyanov reiterated that the USSR is willing to develop and encourage friendly relations with Malaysia, which plays a (?constructive) role in regional and international affairs. The similar policies of our two countries on the most pressing issues of the modern era, and the experience we have gained from political dialogue serve as a strong foundation for the deepening of Soviet-Malaysian relations on the basis of mutual benefit and equality.

After the presentation of the credentials and an exchange of speeches, Mr Lukyanov and Mr Mohamed Harun held intimate talks.

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Defense Minister Interviewed
PM0808094589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Aug 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Lt Gen Shahnawaz Tanai, Afghan defense minister, by "Our Special Correspondent" M. Yusin: "There Are Still Many 'Hot Spots'"; date of interview not stated]

[Text] Kabul—[Yusin] Mr Minister, please describe the military situation in the country. What spots remain "hot" in Afghanistan now?

[Tanai] Today it may be said that the hardest days for the Afghan Army are in the past. There was a critical period in early spring when the enemy launched large-scale forces on Jalalabad. There was a moment when it seemed to us that its fate was hanging by a thread: Hand-to-hand fighting was under way on the territory of the airfield, whose loss would have been a very grave blow to the city's defenders. But our army nonetheless succeeded in repelling the attacks and at the same time disproving all the forecasts of those who predicted that within weeks of the Soviet troops' withdrawal the government would fall and the armed opposition would seize power.

The enormous losses suffered by the opposition forces at Jalalabad and in other places have aggravated the internecine warfare in their camp. Every day various groupings settle accounts with each other in several Afghan provinces. The split in the enemy's ranks is undermining his last chances of achieving any significant successes before the onset of the cold weather.

If we are speaking of "hot spots," then I would put Khowst first. The enemy has considered that right now this city is the most vulnerable link in our defense. There are several explanations for that. First, Khowst is situated in the immediate vicinity (just 15 km) from the Pakistani border. Second, the city's food and ammunition supplies and the delivery of reinforcements can only be effected by air. All this creates certain difficulties for the garrison and the enemy has decided to take advantage of that.

In early July fierce fighting began round Khowst. A large grouping of opposition members numbering 10,000 to 12,000 men is operating here. They have succeeded in substantially pressing back our troops, and the command had to urgently transfer reserves to the region under threat and to deliver rocket and bomb strikes against the advancing enemy.

As a result of the measures which were taken the rebels' attacks on the city have misfired. Of course, it cannot be said that the danger has been completely eliminated but as a whole the situation has been stabilized. Our army's successful counterattacks have made it possible to establish control over some, albeit not all, positions lost in the first days of the enemy offensive.

I would call Kabul the second "hot spot" on the map of Afghanistan. Considerable opposition forces have been gathered around it. According to our information up to 10,000 members of the opposition are now operating immediately next to the foremost units of the city's defenders. Every week the opposition leaders declare a new date for storming the capital but when the appointed time approaches the offensive is invariably deferred. I can only explain this by the fact that the opposition is very well aware that Kabul is beyond it. The only thing it can do is to shower the capital with rockets, sowing death and destruction in the residential areas.

In the region of Jalalabad the situation is now far calmer than a few months ago. The city is gradually returning to normal life, classes have begun in the schools and universities, and the Kabul-Jalalabad highway is in operation. You form the impression that the opposition has lost hope of seizing the city: The enemy's activeness has declined markedly. Our army now has the initiative on this sector.

Qandahar remains a "hot spot," although the intensiveness of the attacks on Afghanistan's second most important city has declined considerably. The garrison is confidently controlling the situation. In recent weeks the situation in the Gardeyz region has been aggravated. The enemy has intensified the onslaught on the positions of the city's defenders but even there he cannot boast of any marked successes.

[Yusin] Do you have figures for the losses of the government troops and the opposition since the Soviet troops' withdrawal from Afghanistan?

[Tanai] I can give you figures for the first 3 months after the Soviet troops' withdrawal. Over this period the opposition lost 25,000 men killed, wounded, taken prisoner, or missing. As for our losses, I shall merely tell you that they were considerably less.

[Yusin] And what is the total numerical strength of the antigovernment formations?

[Tanai] If you take into account the entire territory of Afghanistan, something in the order of 200,000.

[Yusin] How many foreigners are fighting in the ranks of the opposition?

[Tanai] Approximately 3,300 men from the Arab countries, mainly Saudi Arabia, and 1,400 Pakistani militia members. There are also advisers from the United States and other Western countries.

[Yusin] Which of the opposition groupings do you consider to have the most combat-capable detachments?

[Tanai] The most disciplined and best trained detachments belong to the two most influential groupings—G. Hikmatyar's "Islamic Party of Afghanistan" and B. Rabbani's "Islamic Society of Afghanistan."

[Yusin] How many provincial centers are under the opposition's control right now?

[Tanai] Well, let's count them: Asadabad (Konar Province), Sharan (Paktia Province), Bamian (Bamian Province), Taloqan (Takhar Province), Mahmud-e Raqi (Kapisa Province). In all, 5 provincial centers out of 31.

[Yusin] Are hostilities continuing between government troops and the Shi'ite groupings which rely on support from Iran?

[Tanai] In the provinces where the influence of the Shi'ite opposition groupings is strong, primarily in Herat, small clashes occur from time to time. Cities are fired on in some places. But it is a long time since there were any serious battles with the Shi'ite opposition detachments.

[Yusin] Has there been an increase in cases of desertion in the Afghan Army since the Soviet troops' withdrawal?

[Tanai] On the contrary, their number has declined by approximately 30 percent.

[Yusin] Recently reports have appeared of cases of Afghan military aircraft and helicopters being hijacked to Pakistan. Is that true?

[Tanai] Yes, there have indeed been such cases. But there has also been something else—on several occasions Pakistani aircraft have forced our aircraft to land at airfields in Pakistan and then Islamabad has announced that the pilots have allegedly deserted with their equipment.

[Yusin] Do you believe that the international conventions on prisoners of war extend to the mujahidin you have captured or do you view these people as rebels or even bandits who have ended up in the hands of the law?

[Tanai] We have fulfilled and will fulfill all international conventions on prisoners of war, extending them to members of the opposition formations.

[Yusin] And one last question: What do you expect from the next few months—a new aggravation of the confrontation or steps on the path of a peace settlement?

[Tanai] I believe that the government army's successes will ultimately persuade the opposition leaders of the futility of attempts at a military solution of the Afghan problem and that they will agree to sit at the conference table with the republic's government.

Afghan Army Leaders on 'Jalalabad Front'
PM0808092889 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Aug 89 First Edition p 3

[Special correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Oliynik "Afghan Reportage": "On the Jalalabad Front"]

[Text] Kabul—It is difficult to get to Jalalabad—the administrative center of the province of Nangarhar, which borders on Pakistan—even now that the armed forces of the Republic of Afghanistan have routed the "irreconcilables" here. The mountain road is still subject to problems, and there are frequent shellings and booby-trap mines. The air corridor from Kabul to Jalalabad is in operation, but a significant section of it passes over territory controlled by the opposition.

Helicopters do not get through every day. I saw that for myself. Twice in the past week I tried to get to Jalalabad on Afghan Air Force helicopters, and each time the takeoff was postponed due to severe shelling of the Jalalabad airfield and the approaches to it.

When we met, 'Abdol Qader, commander in chief of the Air Force and Air Defense Forces, spread his hands:

"What can you do—it's war. If you need the latest information from the Jalalabad Front, go to the Afghan Army Combat Control Center. Reports come in from there every hour."

But before going to the Combat Control Center, I called on Colonel General Asef Delawar, chief of the Afghan Army General Staff, who kindly agreed to tell KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's correspondent about the situation around Jalalabad. He knows it in detail, and not only from operational dispatches and reports—for 4.5 of the most worrying months he was in command of the Jalalabad Front. And he was replaced only a few days ago by Colonel General Muhammad Azimi, Afghan first deputy defense minister.

"The official title 'Jalalabad Front' appeared on our operations maps for the first time in mid-March," Colonel General Delawar says. "Then, as you know, a large rebel grouping was waging a continuous offensive on Jalalabad. In order to defend the city a single line of defense more than 50 km long was put in place around it. On the basis of the military-political and strategic plan for the defense of Jalalabad, the Supreme Command adopted a decision to form a Jalalabad Front, with all the ensuing consequences.

"The first impact was taken by units of the 11th Infantry Division, which were placed on the heights east of Samarkheyl [as transliterated]," Colonel General Delawar goes on. "With support from the tanks and artillery of the regular Pakistani Army, the rebels broke through the defense on this main salient, seized Ghaziabad and then Samarkheyl, and approached the airfield. That was the worst time for us. Corps commander Lieutenant General Barakzay [as transliterated] died in the fighting, and there were other grievous losses too. In many defense sectors it reached the point of hand-to-hand fighting. More than once I myself and other generals and officers of the front staff had to take up arms and go into the trenches...

"But we stood firm, and then went onto the counteroffensive and drove the rebels back beyond Samarkheyl. In these offensive actions good work was done by the servicemen of the 37th Paratroop Brigade under the command of Major General Asadullo [as transliterated], the 15th Tank Brigade headed by Major General Ubaydgol [as transliterated], the special purpose guards... Our rocket artillery and aviation operated with great effectiveness. Suffice it to say that there were days when our airmen were making 300 aircraft-flights per day on the Jalalabad Front. A crushing blow was inflicted on the opposition at the walls of the ancient city. In the course of fighting we destroyed 36 tanks, more than 80 field guns, 440 rocket shell launchers, 14 command centers, and more than 20 weapon and ammunition dumps. The rebels lost more than 20,000 men, killed or wounded..."

Thanking the chief of General Staff for the interview, I set off for the Combat Control Center. Here Major General Ismail, deputy chief of the General Staff Operations Directorate, familiarized me with the present situation on the Jalalabad Front:

"At 0900 hours today, the front line of defense is as follows: the eastern outskirts of the settlement of Surdeval [as transliterated], height 556, 2.5 km east of Samarkheyl. To the north of Jalalabad active defense is being conducted by Nangarhar Province Ministry of State Security and Ministry of Internal Affairs units, which are holding back the Konarha rebel grouping. On 1 August a probing action was carried out in the Ghaziabad salient, where the armed opposition headquarters is located. The commanding height of Choragalay [as transliterated], from which the entire locality can be seen, is again in our hands. This is the fifth time it has changed hands. We hope that this time the height will remain ours permanently."

"The situation is returning to normal, not only on the front," Major General Ismail noted, "but also in the city itself. During the siege of Jalalabad the rebels destroyed some 500 houses and mosques, 4 factories, and more than 40 public buildings. Despite this devastation, the

surviving enterprises and private workshops have now resumed work. Schools and the polytechnical institute have opened. The government is taking all measures to restore Jalalabad."

...For nearly 6 months the name of Jalalabad has been constantly on the Afghans' lips. They are now calling this city the "Afghan Stalingrad." And rightly so. Its defenders showed heroism and staunchness. They also made a decisive contribution to the defeat of opposition forces at Jalalabad.

The fighting for Jalalabad once again graphically demonstrated the full futility of the path of military strength, which the armed opposition is still gambling on.

East Europe

PZPR's Rakowski Cited on Party Tasks

PM0908113789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Aug 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Discussions on the Future of the Polish United Workers Party"]

[Text] The party should become the motive force behind the process of change, M. Rakowski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee, stated at a meeting with the party and trade union aktiv at the Warsaw Car Plant.

Socialism as an ideological and political formation, he stressed, has become a historical fact. This cannot be undone, but there is no social system which has not encountered difficulties and abrupt changes. These are inevitable. The problem is how to overcome them.

The party is now widely discussing the PZPR's future. Such discussions are needed to get us out of the ossified state in which we find ourselves.

Touching on the statements on the need to convene the 11th PZPR Congress this year, M. Rakowski said that there is no chance of this happening, since a congress cannot be restricted merely to preparing certain declarations. The congress has an opportunity to become a turning point if it is preceded by an extensive discussion among the 2-million-strong army of party members.

The party is now galvanizing its activeness. If in the next few months we are able to increase this activeness, oppose the attacks on us, and prove we are right, PZPR members will soon feel better. This is all in our hands.

Talking about his attitude to the opposition, M. Rakowski stated that he is fully prepared for constructive cooperation with it.

Polish Politburo Discusses Walesa Statement

LD0908091489 Moscow TASS in English 0656 GMT 9 Aug 89

[Text] Warsaw August 9 TASS—The Polish United Workers Party (PUWP) Politburo met on Tuesday to consider problems connected with the formation of a new government.

The meeting noted the efforts of Czeslaw Kiszczak, who was entrusted with this mission by the Sejm on a proposal from the Polish president, towards forming a "grand coalition" government. Support for a "grand coalition" was reaffirmed.

Attention was drawn to Lech Walesa's statement in which he opposed the formation of a government by Kiszczak. Without overestimating the importance of the statement, the Politburo members drew attention to the fact that Walesa's statement complicates the process of quickly forming an efficient and competent cabinet.

Walesa's proposal is fraught with the danger of a government crisis which would not help to stabilise the situation in the country, members of Politburo emphasised.

His proposal also indicates a desire to negate all the achievements of the roundtable talks.

Having considered and determined tasks and conclusions arising from the resolution of the 13th plenary meeting of the PUWP Central Committee, the Politburo specially emphasised that, considering the current situation and the emergence of a new correlation of political and parliamentary forces, the principles of accord and drive should become the leading ones in the work of party committees and organisations: accord with all forces that are guided by the people's and the state's well-being with respect for diversity of their views and a drive to overcome any actions directed against socialism and law and order in Poland.

The Politburo, having analysed problems connected with the introduction of market mechanisms to the food sphere, called on party bodies to support all initiatives aimed at improving the food situation and to energetically cooperate with all social forces, primarily the trade unions, to eliminate shortcomings.

Efforts To Form Polish Government Continue

LD0808193689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Polish Premier Czeslaw Kiszczak is continuing his consultations aimed at forming a new government of the country. Having put forward a proposal for forming a grand coalition government with the participation of the principal political forces of the country represented in the Sejm, Kiszczak has had meetings and talks with the leaders of the United Peasant Party and the Democratic Party, and others.

Solidarity Chairman Walesa has published a statement in which he categorically opposed the formation of a new government. Walesa considers the only political solution in the present situation to be the creation of a council of ministers based on a Solidarity coalition, which is what he intends to strive for.

New Polish Premier Kiszczak Profiled
PM0908084789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Aug 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS correspondent V. Volkov dispatch for PRAVDA under general heading "Sejm Decision. Czeslaw Kiszczak—Chairman of the Polish People's Republic Council of Ministers"]

[Text] Warsaw—Czeslaw Kiszczak was born in a peasant family in Roczyny Village, Bielsko Voivodship, in 1925. His youth coincided with the period of Hitlerite occupation in Poland. He played an active part in the Resistance Movement, and in 1945 joined the Polish People's Army, serving in military intelligence and counterintelligence and holding a series of command posts. He graduated from the General Staff Academy in 1957. In 1972-1979 he was deputy chief of the General Staff, and afterwards chief of the Ministry of National Defense Military Internal Service. He was appointed to the office of minister of internal affairs of the Polish People's Republic in August 1981. Soon afterwards he was awarded the rank of general.

C. Kiszczak's sociopolitical activity is distinguished by great activeness. In the first postwar years he became a member of the Polish Workers Party. He was elected member of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee in 1981, candidate member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo in 1982, and later became member of the Politburo.

Following the introduction of martial law in Poland in December 1981 (a forced step which prevented a national catastrophe resulting from actions by extremist elements) C. Kiszczak became a member of the Military Council for National Salvation, which performed important tasks in stabilizing the situation and creating preconditions for the implementation of reforms in the country and the achievement of national accord. He simultaneously performed the functions of chairman of the Polish People's Republic Council of Ministers Committee for Observance of Laws, Law and Order, and Public Discipline. It was in this capacity that C. Kiszczak was authorized in August 1988 to put forward the initiative of starting talks with representatives o broad spectrum of the country's main political forces, including figures from church circles and "Solidarity." Just a single goal was set—to galvanize the process of national accord.

Major importance attached to C. Kiszczak's meetings with "Solidarity" leader Lech Walesa. All this culminated in the well known "roundtable" talks between representatives of the government, the trade unions, and the constructive opposition.

C. Kiszczak is firmly perceived not only by the government coalition but also by the opposition as an active champion of reforms and national accord, and has gained respect through his flexible and constructive stance and his tactful attitude toward the arguments and positions of partners.

Jaruzelski, Rakowski Plenum Speeches Cited
PM0808095989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Aug 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Combining Effectiveness and Justice"]

[Text] Warsaw, 31 Jul—The 13th Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee Plenum showed that even in unusually difficult conditions the party can find collective wisdom and strength, PZPR President W. Jaruzelski said, speaking at the plenum's final sitting. We have come a step nearer to a new idea of Polish socialism and sown good seeds.

The main question now, the key to the future, is how to combine the requisite radical increase in economic effectiveness with the preservation of the principles of social justice, those true gains of socialism.

Our supreme desire and aim is a strong, secure, and just Poland, the president stressed. The party must conform with the spirit of the time, the new conditions, and the ever-increasing scale of requirements, and rise to our tasks as we enter the 21st century.

In his speech M. Rakowski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, pointed out that the debate at the plenum was characterized by the fact that it concentrated not on the past but on what lies ahead and what must be done to ensure that the party restores its positions in society, becomes the vanguard in the formation of socialist relations in Poland, and strengthens the belief that the chosen path of reform is beneficial for the Polish people and the future of socialism, both in Poland and the world. There are 2 million of us. That is a great force, he said. We must not allow ourselves to be suppressed or bowed down by demagogic slogans or the total denial of the historic achievements of the past few decades when there were revolutionary changes beneficial for the people, from whom we arose and with whom we are linked forever. It is sometimes difficult now to draw the line between making the requisite innovations in socialism and opportunist concessions which erode the principles on which our movement arose and from which people's Poland emerged.

The first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee pointed out that everything which is happening in Poland along with its efforts to build socialism which accords with the behest of the time affect other socialist countries. By offering support to the opposition, the main centers of the capitalist world link different aims with the development of the situation in Poland. One cannot close one's eyes to the fact that along with healthful reforming trends one also encounters importunate entreaties of a class nature. The offensive by anti-communist forces is also a fact that must not be underestimated. Consensus and struggle are the main principles in the party's activity on the path of genuine democratization of political, social, and economic relations, M. Rakowski stressed.

Poland's Economic Problems, Reforms Viewed

PM0808132589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Aug 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by TASS correspondent A. Pershin specially for IZVESTIYA: "One Choice Made, Others Ahead"]

[Text] Warsaw—This summer in Poland, time seems to have taken on a second dimension: Within the space of just a few weeks highly significant changes have taken place in the country, the kind of changes that in the past would have taken months or even years.

When W. Jaruzelski was elected Polish president on 19 July, many sighed with relief and hope—and not only Poles. A colleague, French journalist Bernard Margueritte, who has been working in Poland for more than 10 years, said: I will not hide my joy, Poland has avoided the catastrophe that W. Jaruzelski's defeat would have been; now the country has guarantees that the policy of reforms and democratization will continue.

Hardly stopping to draw breath, W. Jaruzelski embarked on an urgent task—to hold consultations to form a government and select a candidate for the post of chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, who will take the helm of the ship that is the Polish economy, which is now in the position of an extremely battered vessel in a raging sea, sending out signals that it is willing to accept assistance from virtually any partner.

Under the constitution, the president proposes the nomination for premier and the latter presents a cabinet for approval by the Sejm. Last week, the head of state held several meetings each day with the leaders of the allied parties—the United Peasants Party and the Democratic Party, the chairmen of lay Catholic and Christian organizations within the coalition, and the leaders of trade unions and social, women's, and youth organizations. It goes without saying that the opposition has also been included in the consultations. Here, for example, is how Lech Walesa, chairman of the "Solidarity" trade union, summed up the results of his conversation with the president at a session of the Citizens (opposition) Parliamentary Floor Group Presidium: "When the opposition has such a landslide victory in the elections as we did, it takes over government. If the coalition is not ready for this, we will remain in the opposition and form a 'shadow cabinet.' All or nothing. Mr President spoke in favor of a broad coalition government, so we chose to differ.... We will be the opposition that watches to see whether the government strays from the path of reforms."

The "all or nothing" principle probably makes a highly effective impression in an operetta or melodrama and possibly in a hit Western movie. But in the real world of politics the scope for its use is incomparably narrower. What is more, the opposition is clearly boxing cleverly. Quite recently, its leaders said that they do not have either a clear program or effective organization or a sufficient quantity of people with the necessary practical qualifications. But now it is "all or nothing." I think that this formula, designed for outward effect, masks quite prosaic aims. The new cabinet has to adopt and implement some extremely unpopular decisions necessary to improve the economy and, what is more, in a situation fraught with a sharp deterioration in the country's social backdrop. The "shadow" cabinet probably wants to enter the stage of political life in the role of some military commander astride a white horse. However, as the opposition has evidently calculated, the time for this entry has not yet come.

W. Jaruzelski has kept his promise, made on the eve of his election as president, that if he were to become head of state he would relinquish the top party post. This is dictated by the role which the constitution assigns to the president: The guarantor of stability in the country and an arbiter standing above the parties. His request to be released from his duties as first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo, and member of the PZPR Central Committee was granted by the 13th Central Committee Plenum, which came to a close on 29 July. Mieczyslaw Rakowski, nominated by W. Jaruzelski, was elected the Polish communists' new leader by a vote of 171 in favor and 41 against.

Since the plenum the upper party echelons have been radically transformed and a process of rejuvenation is under way. The Central Committee has granted the request to release a number of members of the Politburo and the Secretariat from their duties. Fresh forces have taken their place.

A mass of serious problems requiring urgent resolution awaits the new first secretary. One of the key problems is that of preparing for the 11th PZPR Congress, which the plenum has decreed should be convened as soon as possible.

At present M. Rakowski is still formally head of the Polish Government, although he has sent a letter to the Sejm requesting that he be allowed to stand down due to the expiration of his term in office. Literally on the eve of the plenum, the Citizens Parliamentary Floor Group issued a statement in which the activity of the cabinet was directly criticized. What is more, opposition parliamentarians have called for the formation of an extraordinary Sejm commission to analyze the work of the government and consider the possibility of sending material on the government to a state tribunal.

It is normal parliamentary practice to demand a report from a government stepping down. But the fact that the opposition is trying to play the part of some judge passing sentence even before the case has been investigated is a way of playing to the gallery. Incidentally, this is the very same government, a place in which "Solidarity" representatives are clearly in no hurry to take up and accordingly assume a measure of responsibility for the future of the country, which, in the last days of its term in power, took a decisive step agreed on during the "roundtable" talks to place the food complex on a market footing.

The problems of indexing wages and prices—vitally important to the country—and, on a broader scale, the situation in the economy will also be discussed at the Sejm session beginning Monday afternoon.

Polish-Made Helicopter Tested in Turkmenistan
LD0808182889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Test flights of the Kania helicopter, developed by the Polish aviation construction company Swidnik, have begun in the Karakums. According to the program, flights have been made when complications have been artificially produced in the craft—the failure of one engine, and various theoretical breakdowns. There was no departure from tolerable norms and the craft performed excellently in the air.

The helicopter is multipurpose and is intended for use in agriculture and in the transportation of various freight. The maximum weight which it can lift is more than 3.5 tonnes.

The tests in Turkmenistan will help the Polish aviation builders to speed up production of the new helicopter.

Polish WWII Withdrawal to Iran Examined
PM0808131689 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[M. Tretyakov reply to reader's letter under the general heading "Dialogue": "Myths and Facts"—first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] "Is it true that during the fighting around Stalingrad General Anders withdrew Polish forces formed on USSR territory to Iran? How does this square with the assertion which appears in certain Polish publications from time to time that the USSR allegedly failed to help Poland in this period?" N. Nerovnyy, Orsk City.

Many myths have grown up around Soviet-Polish relations during World War II and the postwar period, and these myths are exploited in the West and by certain people in Poland itself to whip up anti-Soviet sentiments in a country that is friendly to us.

This applies to the first Polish formations and units set up on Soviet territory in accordance with the Soviet-Polish agreements of 30 July and 14 August 1941. The USSR Government and the Polish emigre government in London agreed that these formations would be operationally under the leadership of the Soviet High Command. The Polish emigre authorities assured us that the formations set up on Soviet territory would be sent to the front as soon as they were combat-ready.

So why did the Anders army go to Iran? We asked Doctor of Historical Sciences Professor M. Monin to answer this question.

The Soviet Government, he said, did its utmost under those conditions to make it easier for a Polish Army to be formed in the USSR. A loan of R300 million was granted for its upkeep. In early December 1941 the Soviet Government agreed to increase the size of the Polish army in the USSR from the initially envisaged figure of 30,000 (two infantry divisions) to 96,000 (six infantry divisions, reserve units, and an officers' school).

By mutual agreement the first Polish divisions were to have completed their combat training by 1 October 1941. However, only one division was combat-ready by February 1942. But the W. Sikorski emigre government and the army's commander, Gen W. Anders, were in no hurry to send it to the front. It transpired that their idea was for the formations set up on Soviet territory to be transferred to the Near East, thereby avoiding involvement in combat alongside Soviet troops in contravention of the agreements with the USSR.

Convinced of the Polish authorities' reluctance to send the army set up in the USSR into combat against the German fascist invaders alongside Soviet troops, the Soviet Government was forced to agree to the Polish formations' withdrawal to Iran. This was at the height of the fighting around Stalingrad, when each division capable of fighting the enemy heading for the Volga was especially valuable. In all more than 113,000 Poles—of whom 75,490 were servicemen and 37,866 were members of their families—were evacuated from the USSR.

In 1943, following an appeal from the Union of Polish Patriots set up on Soviet territory, thousands of Poles who had found themselves on Soviet soil after 1939 joined the reborn Polish Army. The Tadeusz Kosciuszko First Infantry Division formed near Ryazan went into its first battle 12 October near Lenino in Belorussia. The

blood jointly shed by Soviet and Polish servicemen in the struggle against the fascists bound our two peoples forever in indissoluble friendship.

The servicemen of the two friendly armies traveled a glorious heroic path. Together they liberated long-suffering Polish soil, and together took Berlin. The red and white Polish flag was hoisted over the defeated Hitlerite capital alongside the victorious Soviet Red Flag.

Latin America & Caribbean

Gorbachev Sends Condolences to Castro

LD0808173889 Moscow TASS in English 1724 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, sent a telegram of condolences to Cuban leader Fidel Castro, expressing a sincere sympathy in connection with a railway disaster in Matanzas Province, which resulted in a loss of human life. "We grieve together with you," says the telegram.

Gorbachev conveyed profound condolences to the families of the dead and injured.

Supreme Soviet Group Ends Visit to Honduras

LD0708105389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0545 GMT 7 Aug 89

[Text] Tegucigalpa 7 Aug (Special TASS correspondent)—On Sunday [6 August] a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by A.A. Mokanu, deputy chairman of the Soviet Union, completed its official visit to Honduras. The Soviet parliamentarians were paying a return visit to this Central American country at the invitation of the Honduran National Assembly. Last year an official delegation from the Honduran Parliament visited the Soviet Union, where it became acquainted with the work of the Supreme Soviet.

In the course of its visit to Honduras, the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation was received by Jose Azcona Hoyo, president of the country, and Carlos Montoya, president of the National Assembly. It also held meetings with Honduran members of parliament, and conducted a familiarization tour around the country. The delegation conveyed an invitation to the deputies of the Honduran National Assembly to pay an official visit to the USSR.

Political & Social

Supreme Soviet 4 Aug Proceedings Reported

Decree on Crime, Corruption Approved

LD0408220689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1330 GMT on 4 August broadcasts a recorded relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet morning session in the Kremlin on 4 August. The relay is monitored in progress. The session is chaired by Mikhail Gorbachev.

Gorbachev speaks of the need to combat crime and corruption. The proposed decree contains specific ideas for this. He invites comment.

At 1332 GMT, an unidentified deputy complains that words in the draft decree about "mass disobedience by criminals" are unclear. Gorbachev says what is meant is incidents in which gangs roam the streets damaging property. Deputy Seleznev reads a reference in the draft to "judges and justice;" he wants "and justice" deleted. Gorbachev says "and justice" will be kept and "judges" will be taken out.

At 1335 GMT, Gorbachev says all will be united behind the decision; it will be right, but everything must be weighed and considered. Deputy Soobshchak suggests adding a special point about urgent changes to the law to give the militia more protection. Murders of militia officers and attacks on them have increased. He presents a petition signed by tens of thousands of Leningraders concerning the murder of a militia woman. He wants the death penalty for such crimes. Gorbachev agrees that tougher penalties are needed, but suggests leaving the details to legislators; they can be considered later.

An unidentified deputy thinks that in a reference to "malicious speculation" the word "malicious" should be dropped. Gorbachev says the deletion will "make it legally more exact." Deputy Golyakov (Moscow) requests that copies of the draft laws on the militia and on states of emergency be distributed to the deputies for study during the recess, and Gorbachev agrees to this. Deputy Podziruk (Ivanovo Oblast) wants the word "poaching" included; Gorbachev approves. Fedorov, from Cheboksary, wants to add to point one of the decree the words: The activity of the provisional committees must be based exclusively on the constitution and the law. He also wants a law on organized crime. All civilized countries have this and the USSR has lacked it up until now because the existence of organized crime has not been acknowledged. He wants a law against perjury and a strengthening of the "material-technical base" of law enforcement. Gorbachev replies that the committees are already required to act within the law: It is just a matter of seeing that they do. A law on organized crime should be considered by those who will be drawing up the new criminal law.

At 1345 GMT, an unidentified deputy says the committees should not be provisional, since you cannot abolish crime once and for all; constant effort is needed. An unidentified deputy recalls a speech by Roy Medvedev and urges that, since there are criminals in the procurator's office, the procurator must be independent. Gorbachev says work is being done on this. Kugultinov, from Elista, says prisoners should be kept in cells and not put to work, otherwise the labor camps become schools for crime. He wants punishment, not education in crime. Kirilov (Voronezh) says the executive committees should be required to provide the militia with premises.

Sukhov (Kharkov Oblast) says law enforcement agencies often cover up crimes and detection is inefficient. An unidentified deputy says the Supreme Soviet should periodically renew the powers of the committees, so that they do not get out of control. Gorbachev says they will not.

The vote is taken. Gorbachev says the decision on crime is passed unanimously. It then turns out that there was one vote against.

At 1358 GMT, Gorbachev introduces the subject of the status of judges and gives the floor to Supreme Court Chairman Smolentsev.

Smolentsev deals with the expenses incurred by courts in carrying out their work and discusses judicial reform in general terms.

At 1403 GMT, Deputy Semenko, a member of the legislative reform committee, reads the committee report which discusses the draft law on court reform. She deals in particular with the question of the independence of courts. Members of the judiciary must be protected from arbitrary dismissal.

At 1412 GMT, Gorbachev asks for questions. In answer to Deputy Bichkauskas, Semenko talks about the committee's views on republican courts and Gorbachev intervenes to say that these are elective bodies.

Protocol, Consular Agreement Ratified

LD0408220789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1414 GMT on 4 August continues its broadcast of the recorded relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 4 August.

An unidentified deputy asks whether suggestions are being submitted to the constitutional committee. The answer is yes.

At 1415 GMT, Semenko answers another deputy by quoting Lenin on the qualities required of judges, such as initiative, etc. She says that a law on juries is being considered.

At 1417 GMT, an Uzbek deputy raises the investigation into the republic's cotton scandal. Judges must be held accountable for their actions. Following a brief question from Deputy Kirilenko, another Uzbek deputy presses Semenko on penalties for errant judges.

At 1422 GMT, Deputy Alekseyev, chairman of the Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, says the law will promote the establishment of a law-governed state and respect for human rights, as well as providing material backup for judges.

At 1425 GMT, Gorbachev proposes a vote. The Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities pass the law on judges. Gorbachev then reads out an announcement: All 15 Soviet societies for the deaf welcome the decision to free them from taxation.

Deputy Dzasokhov speaks on ratification of international documents. International obligations provide a guarantee of irreversible perestroyka. Following changes to the Soviet Constitution in 1988, ratification of international documents is now a matter for the Supreme Soviet—a democratic development.

At 1436 GMT, Dzasokhov hands over to Neyland, secretary of the International Affairs Committee. The matter in hand is the additional protocols to the Geneva Convention on war invalids.

At 1441 GMT, Deputy Medvedev asks whether the protocols will apply to Soviet soldiers who fought in Afghanistan. Neyland says yes, they will. The next matter is a consular convention with Turkey. Turkey ratified the convention in March of this year. It permits better protection of the rights of Soviet citizens in Turkey and will develop relations with that country.

At 1444 GMT, Gorbachev puts the ratification to a vote. The Geneva protocols are ratified with nobody voting against. The consular agreement is ratified with two votes against the one abstention. The morning session then ends.

Konarev Candidacy Debated

LD0408220889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1448 GMT on 4 August continues its broadcast of the recorded relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet sesson in the Kremlin on 4 august. The afternoon session is chaired by Mikhail Gorbachev.

Gorbachev opens the session with the question of appointing the USSR minister of railways. He invites Ryzhkov to speak.

At 1450 GMT, Ryzhkov says that many railway workers have written to the government for Konarev's nomination as railway minister to be reviewed. The Supreme Soviet transport commission failed to reach a consensus: Some support Konarev, others are against. Ryzhkov acknowledges that there are problems on the railways. He himself believes that Konarev could head the railways, but he will only propose him if he has the support of the deputies.

At 1453 GMT, Gorbachev reads some of the letters received in favor of renominating Konarev. This is why he has brought up the issue for discussion. Gorbachev's view is that Konarev is an "outstanding executive...with great organizational abilities," though the criticism voiced is just. He is not a man who can be accused of playing for time despite difficulties in the railway industry. Gorbachev himself supports Konarev as railways minister.

At 1458 GMT, a deputy proposes a vote on whether to renominate Konarev.

At 1459 GMT, Yeltsin speaks from the rostrum. He knows Konarev well and considers him capable of heading the railways. All but one member of the construction committee support Konarev.

At 1500 GMT, Tetenev, chairman of the transport commission, says that the railway has worked well since 1983, fulfilling freight plans etc. Problems with passenger transport are due to a shortage of rolling stock and material shortages. Tetenev goes on to say that this is no time for experimenting: There is nobody who can replace Konarev as railway minister. He asks the deputies to support Konarev.

At 1504 GMT, Kucherenko takes the floor. He is astounded by Konarev's rejection: He is a "courageous...and intelligent leader." Emotions sometimes lead to mistakes: Konarev is the man for the job.

At 1506 GMT, Voskoboynikov, deputy chairman of the transport commission, speaks. He talks of a visit to the railway ministry collegium to hear its views. It criticized the Supreme Soviet for not electing Konarev. Circumstances are such, however, that the railways will not advance very far under Konarev's leadership.

At 1510 GMT, an unidentified deputy comes to the rostrum to state that the railways need Konarev. He speaks on behalf of the "absolute majority" of railway workers.

At 1511 GMT, another unidentified deputy representing the railways complains about conditions in the industry, nonetheless agreeing that Konarev should be elected.

At 1517 GMT, Kanarevskaya, a Moldavian deputy, says that poor organization of railway work in the absence of a minister is causing losses of produce. She proposes electing Konarev for a trial period of 1 or 2 years, then holding a new election.

At 1519 GMT, Deputy Vnebrachnyy, another railway worker, deplores the lack of respect for the Supreme Soviet's "wise" decision to reject Konarev. Staff and passengers have to put up with bad conditions. Railway workers are "exploited," hence the high accident rate. The "overwhelming majority" of railway workers regard the rejection of Konarev as a "logical reaction" to what is going on in the industry.

At 1525 GMT, an unidentified deputy suggests a compromise: Ryzhkov should appoint Konarev as railway minister for 1 year; he should then run for reelection to the post.

At 1529 GMT, Gorbachev suggests that they think about the issue during the break.

Konarev Elected Railway Minister

LD0408220989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1529 GMT on 4 August broadcasts a recorded relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 4 August. The evening session is chaired by Mikhail Gorbachev.

Gorbachev opens the session by reading a letter from Ryzhkov proposing the renomination of Konarev as USSR minister of railways.

At 1531 GMT, Gorbachev puts Konarev's nomination to a vote: 245 in favor, 110 against, 23 abstentions. Konarev is elected railway minister.

At 1535 GMT, Gorbachev makes a concluding speech. At the end of his speech, Gorbachev declares the USSR Supreme Soviet session closed.

Supreme Soviet Ratifies Supplementary Protocol

LD0808150889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1405 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow, 8 Aug (TASS)—The USSR Supreme Soviet has ratified the supplementary protocol to the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 (which concerns protecting the victims of international armed conflicts (Protocol 1)) and the supplementary protocol to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 (concerning the protection of victims of noninternational armed conflicts (Protocol 2)).

The decision stresses the USSR's recognition ipso facto of the competence of the international commission to establish the facts. The Soviet Government must submit a proposal to introduce the relevant amendments to the USSR legislation to the country's parliament within 6 months.

Lukyanov Interviewed on Supreme Soviet Results

LD0708224589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 7 Aug 89

[Interview with Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by Aleksandr Krutov, Central Television commentator, people's deputy, and Lyudmila Shvedova, TASS special correspondent, about the results of the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet; date and place of interview not given; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] Esteemed comrades, we have for you an interview with Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by Aleksandr Krutov, Central Television commentator, people's deputy, and Lyudmila Shvedova, TASS special correspondent, about the results of the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Begin recording] [Krutov] Anatoliy Ivanovich, do you feel that you are on vacation?

[Lukyanov] I think that "vacation" is a fairly relative notion. This is a short break in the work of the Supreme Soviet. And the most important thing is that the work of commissions is still going to continue now—the committees are going to carry on with their work. As soon as the session ended we met, literally within the hour, with the chairmen of the committees and commissions and arranged that first they would single out the people who would remain in Moscow during the vacation—the so-called vacation—and carry on with the work. That is point one—that is, the work of the commissions goes on.

The majority of the deputies are going home and first of all they are going to meet their constituents. The work goes on. And on top of that, they are going to continue their work on a whole number of bills which are now being prepared. So vacation is a relative notion. [laughs]

[Krutov, laughing] It is relative all right. You recall, of course, all these appraisals that were made of the Supreme Soviet during its election at the congress. It was Stalinist-Brezhnevite; it was incompetent; it was a play thing in the hands of the apparatus. And now the first session is over. Are you satisfied with its work?

[Lukyanov] Well, I think the significance of this session, its political significance, was defined by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his closing speech. Its significance indeed was truly great. But, if we are to speak frankly, I would name three main features. The first one is that above all the session of the Supreme Soviet became a direct, immediate continuation of what the congress was doing, of its directives. I would like to note that the first and most important document to be adopted—and it was debated very energetically—was a document on organizing the work for carrying out the decisions of the congress. And it was not just simply on carrying them out, but the deputies thought through

which commission was going to be given which sector, which bill. That was how the first two decisions of exceptional importance for continuing the work of the congress appeared. Therein lies the essence of the work of the Supreme Soviet as a legislating, ordaining, and controlling body, a body that was formed by the congress, as a body which carries out the directives of the congress. That's the first point.

The second point—and this, too, is of exceptional importance: It had been said that the congress would meet, elect the Supreme Soviet, and that would end its functions, so to speak, while the Supreme Soviet would go on by itself, as an autonomous unit. None of this has happened. In practice, the Supreme Soviet has been working with the constant participation of people's deputies who are not elected members of the Supreme Soviet. How was this expressed? I suppose I should cite some figures.

[Krutov] Yes, of course.

[Lukyanov] First of all, 928 people's deputies were elected to the commissions and committees. Of these only 51 percent are members of the Supreme Soviet; the rest are people's deputies. That means that in practice more than 400 people's deputies, who make up the congress, worked here permanently. Apart from that, the session itself was constantly attended by people's deputies. At the last sitting I think there were 80 or 90 people's deputies and every one of them was given the floor if he wanted to speak. That is, the continuation consisted in the very active participation of people's deputies in all Supreme Soviet work. Apart from that, we have sent to the deputies' homes a great number of all manner of documents that were being debated at the session. That's the second phenomenon, to my mind also of exceptional importance.

And the third thing: We have continued the very same tradition of glasnost which we had at the congress. Probably not many people know that the way it turned out was that the congress produced 95 hours of air time, while the [Supreme Soviet] session had considerably more than 100 hours in its 50 sittings. All this took place before the people's eyes.

[Krutov] Excuse me, what was it like to work under the gaze of cameras, by the way?

[Lukyanov] I think we slowly got used to it, gradually got used to it, and at times even forgot that we were constantly under the gaze of the cameras. And that is quite dangerous because first of all our viewers are not used to parliamentary debates, and secondly, we have to think all the time about what kind of response our words will evoke in the viewers, in various nationalities, ethnic groups. This wasn't always taken into consideration. It is a very subtle and difficult thing.

[Krutov] And so, the first stage of your work was the creation of the government. For 3 weeks you listened to candidates for ministers' posts—they were asked various questions, were given diverse evaluations—such were the stormy debates of polemics, and everything was decided by open voting. You know, in my opinion, and not just in my opinion, that was a new approach to the appointment of a government. What do you think, has such a dual, entrance monitoring [kontrol] justified itself?

[Lukyanov] On the whole, for the first time, with the formation of the government, the word "formation" was filled with a real content. That is in the first place. In the second place, that dual monitoring [kontrol] gave a great deal not just to the government itself. Well, I have spoken with several deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers, with ministers and on the whole, they, for the first time, many of them, have elaborated a real program of their activities. Previously, everything drifted along, and here one had to analyze and report. After all, many of them, such as the chairman of the State Planning Committee Gosplan, gave reports on their programs and answered deputies' questions for around 5 hours.

Well, that is the first thing. So, the ministers themselves benefited a great deal. And they left the parliamentary rostrum confirmed, and completely different. The fact of the matter is that they received power from the representatives of the people, having gone through a very serious, serious, democratic working over [prorabotka]. That is the first thing.

The second is that it was a school for the deputies themselves, an impressive one. I came across in the newspapers today that Deputy Filshin writes that it was not just a school—a school of democracy, of understanding of our economy, of understanding what is happening in every sector, of the country's life, in economics, in the economy, in social construction, in social and cultural construction. It was a whole academy, he writes. And I agree. That is, for the first time, the deputies touched upon what is happening in every area. And I think that is very good and there was no need to grudge the time on that. And the third thing. Take our people,—what did they know about our ministers? Let's say this. (?Seen) fleetingly somewhere in the presidium, somewhere at some meeting or another, they will sometimes give an interview on the television but here, for the first time, for many hours on end, they [the people] saw the parliament select one after the other the best leaders of the sector. That is colossal. Incidentally, for some reason, it goes unnoticed that, after all, the Supreme Soviet not only adopted a decision on every minister, it also adopted a decision according to which 16 ministries were abolished. The central administrativ apparatus has been reduced by 16 ministries—that is 15,000 people. Moreover, there were great disputes and the deputies did not always agree with the abolition of one or another ministry. That's important. And there's another detail. They are saying that the Supreme Soviet did not agree with six

management officials, rejected them, that they disputed and rejected part of the commissions. But it seems to me that the final day was a very remarkable one, when the Supreme Soviet found the courage to correct decisions which it had adopted, perhaps influenced by excessive emotions or the state of the industry. And, indeed, there were a lot of shortcomings there. But it found the courage. This, so to speak, wise approach to an industry, an ability to realize the whole complexity of the situation, and to select a man who at this stage is capable of rallying people to work, is exceptionally important. I think that the maturity of parliament was clearly shown in this fact. Every day it became more mature and more thorough in solving these questions.

[Krutov] But, of course, as a human being one feels for those candidates who did not make it, but when you imagine those empty shelves and the millions of hectares of spoiled, dug-up land, the huge lines, then Anatoliy Ivanovich, you know, I think that one needs even tougher selection in order to become a minister, to take up the office of minister?

[Lukyanov] Well, I think that this selection that took place was, first, not merely a tough one, but also a selection for the future because you speak about dual control, but I think that dual control is not enough. Now, when we selected people, heads of industries, by dual control, this was just a part. What is needed is triple control, but at the moment the Supreme Soviet did not properly deal with triple control. This third control is control over those he appointed. Then we come to how the appointee's decisions will be implemented. This third control is, perhaps, the chief function of the Supreme Soviet.

[Krutov] When appointed ministers have explained their programs, how they see their work, and how they see the work of their ministry and their industry, I think it would be quite useful if they had regular report-backs in commissions and committees, and even in chambers or at the session, on how they are fulfilling their programs, and as they say, if you cannot manage the job, then fine.

[Lukyanov] Some ministers were warned when they were appointed that in a year's time we would listen to them, but interestingly, this remained, as it were, outside the attention of television, too. The commissions began hearings, and so did the committees. And the committees here heard some very interesting questions, and immediately there was, so to say, a real return on them. Well, let us say, the Committee for the Protection of the People's Health heard a question about medicines for the population. So on its initiative the Supreme Soviet adopted a decision on the allocation of money in foreign currency to buy in medicines. That was for medicines, food, and so on, but medicines for R500 million in hard currency. And there is now a concrete thing. Or let us say, the Committee on Affairs of Women and the Committee on Youth Affairs put forward a very important, serious question on students' Army service. That was their initiative. It was supported by the Supreme Soviet, and we know about this decision. Incidentally, I do not know whether you noticed that mothers sent two huge bunches of roses to us in the Supreme Soviet and we did not know...[laughs] simply huge bunches of roses because of this business, although this question was discussed, this question is not an easy one, either for the Army or for the country, but it was necessary to solve it. Finally, we noticed that even a committee like the Committee for Defense and State Security Questions also heard several questions. Among others it heard Moiseyev, the head of the general staff, on restructuring the Army, and so to say, on cost-conscious management of resources for the Army. It heard a question about the conversion of military production.

That is to say, monitoring has already begun, but this is only the first step. The monitoring function of the Supreme Soviet, as it grows, develops, and strengthens, will perhaps be the most important thing in its work, along with its legislative function.

[Krutov] You remember how many arguments the new government gave rise to. There were differing evaluations of the new government, but when there was talk, hearings about the law, the amendments to the law on state enterprises, the government turned out to be more radical than the Supreme Soviet.

[Lukyanov] Well, I think that in this case, which is a remarkable one, there is one very substantial detail: The fact is, in the 4 years of perestroyka our government has been practically completely renewed. Experts have come into it, major scientists, academicians, doctors of sciences. Experts have come into it, often ones who have risen from worker to minister. That is also very good. That is, people thoroughly knowing their sector. This has sometimes happened unnoticed. And many of the people are young, so active.

And by tradition, in our country, whenever the administrative-command system was mentioned it would be called the apparatus and the administrative apparatus. So, this government is an apparatus, a system of administration, but in the course of perestroyka it has also changed. Thus, the unambiguous attitude to the apparatus as a gathering of ignorant, crusty officialdom—the times for this have changed. The apparatus is changing. This should be noted.

And I think that the fact that the government has so actively responded to everything, that it has drafted these bills, is not an accidental fact. In our country the actual bill on amending the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) is noticed, but what is not noticed is that another very important resolution was adopted, replacing the administrative-command method, the administrative methods of assessing the incomes of enterprises, in order that the growth of labor productivity and remuneration of labor should go steadily and more or

less synchronously, replacing this machinery by economic methods. Indeed, this was also done and was proposed by the government. I know that for several nights—Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin told me—for several nights they worked together with deputies.

And there is another thing which is also not very noticeable: The government paid attention to the deputies assembling the workers, representatives of enterprises. Deputy Viktor Ivanovich Kisin assembled representatives here in Moscow and had a very detailed discussion with them. This was not only Travkin's proposal but the proposal of these deputies and these workers. So, I think it is a very good thing that here the interests of the government and the deputies have been combined. And the future relations of the government and the Supreme Soviet which would be in keeping with our Soviet system, these are relations of continual dialogue, relations of constructive, sensible criticism, relations of verification.

[Krutov] Questions of standing orders of the Supreme Soviet. You must remember how many disputes were caused both among electors and deputies. Some said, we and the government have been debating for 3 weeks, how much time can be allowed? Others said there would not be enough time for the law, we are giving very little attention to the laws, and analysis is needed. What is the truth about this, what do you think? How will these questions be decided in the future?

[Lukyanov] I think that each of us deputies could probably say the phrase from the children's fairy-tale: I'm no magician, I'm still just learning. So, we are learning this democracy and political culture, and democratic forms of behavior, and dialogue, and much else besides. And I don't think that regulations will take shape immediately. Even on the eve of the session, at a meeting with deputies on the eve of the congress, I said that we would master what are very complex regulations. And it is a good thing that we adopted provisional rules for passing draft laws, provisional rules for ratifying treaties, and so on. All this will iron itself out, will work out in the end. But there is one important thing which everyone has come to a conclusion about already, and that it is necessary. I am talking about the correlation between the commissions—the work of the commissions—and the Supreme Soviet itself. It is perfectly clear that some two-thirds of the work should comprise the work of the commissions and the committees and the working through of documents and submitting them for the sessions later, once they have been worked through. One does not rule out here clashes of opinions and dialogue, there will be all of that, but, still, provision must be made for this correlation. And all this must be provided for in the regulations. The regulations are an important thing, but they must still be subordinate to the substance.

[Krutov] You know, Anatoliy Ivanovich, we saw how you conducted the first sitting and subsequent sittings, and it was noticeable that the work of the session enabled you and the members of the Supreme Soviet to, as it were, pass through a parliamentary university, and this parliamentary university was probably—if I may be frank—was probably no easier than the Moscow State University from which you graduated.

[Lukyanov] I think that this whole political reform in general—perestroyka—has been a very complex process—this rejection of stereotypes—for each one of us, and for the deputies, for each manager and for each individual worker. Marx once said that the most impregnable fortress in the world was the human head. So, one must first win people's minds. And that is why it is very difficult, especially when one is chairing a session one has to be above squabbles and in control of the dialogue, often. He must be, as it were, independent, although this does not rule out the fact that sometimes the chairman and his first deuty might vote differently. Maybe you haven't noticed it, but it's a fact! [chuckles] But, on the other hand, at the same time one had to maintain this dialogue, an interesting, often unorthodox one. But if you are talking about the main conclusion of the session and the congress, then we have discovered—started to discover—so many interesting people, unorthodox, unusual people who are able to talk without any notes, who are able to prove the justness of their cause, who can work with people; a huge number of these people—that is probably the most important.

Because after all today it is at the congress and tomorrow it is at the session of other soviets. The country has gotten to the point when a whole class of people who at one time were somewhere in the background have come forward and shown themselves. The most striking personalities. The person in the chair should not show particular emotions, as it were, but I already know at least some two hundred people in the Supreme Soviet who can express their standpoint clearly.

[Krutov] You mean you know he will come to the rostrum and what he will say.

[Lukyanov] Yes. But the most important thing is that I know that the person will be passionately concerned about his cause. There are well-known people. Well, let's say, Travkin revealed himself in a new way for me when he started to ask questions about local self government. Very interesting ones.

But there are people who, let's say, have revealed themselves bit by bit. For example Nina Ivanovna Piryazeva from Novosibirsk is a very interesting person. An interesting person, who has profoundly understood all the questions connected with social justice, and she has spoken on this question. Or such an energetic person, let's say, like Sazonov, from Naberezhnyye Chelny. He also has his standpoint, his interesting and unconventional view. Or Professor Anatoliy Alekseyevich Denisov, from Leningrad. Somehow I started to understand more profoundly the standpoint of this person especially

on such complex questions as relations between the party and state and bodies of power and of management. He has a very profound and interesting approach to these issues.

I could give lots more names of such unconventional, unusual people, who have put forward very, er...[corrects himself] their own points of view on all problems. I think that that is how the generation of future politicians is growing up, the politicians of the age of perestroyka. And the Supreme Soviet and the congress are a sort of academy, a people's academy, for this matter. This is very good.

[Krutov] Of course a lot depends on the chair at the Supreme Soviet, on how he conducts the meeting, the session, and I even recall a moment when it was necessary to replace the chair.

[Lukyanov] There was such a case, but it was the last, after all.

[Krutov] There was, yes. But now on the other hand, you know, deputies have sometimes tried to get into their address everything that has come to a head and this led to verbosity, somehow distracting from the essence. Do you agree? [Lukyanov murmurs agreement] So what do you think, will it be possible to ensure a more business-like course of discussion in the future? Incidentally, the voters are talking about this, too.

[Lukyanov] Well, a great deal is written about this. And yet at the first stage I would have acted more carefully, more carefully. I would not have started to remove all emotion. Perhaps, if we discuss and ponder like that—how can I explain it?

On the whole, our Soviet parliament cannot operate without emotion. It is not possible without emotion. And I think this because, in the first place, it is in itself the collective portrait of our country, of our society, of its social strata, its, so to speak, its moods, its national features—multinational. After all, representatives of several republics, especially of the southern republics, spoke very heatedly, for example, while at the same time the representatives of, say, the Baltic states spoke very moderately and calmly. However, there was a charm in the clashes of interests and emotions. It seems to me that our Soviet democracy and our Soviet parliamentarism is not a kind of lukewarm parliamentarism. It will always be an emotional parliamentarism and I do not see anything terrible in that. That is how politics are born—born before people's very eyes—and that is very good. Incidentally, the state Russian parliament [Duma] was also rather an emotional body and I recently had occasion to get to know its protocols.

[Kryutov] And also studied how they worked?

[Lukyanov] Yes, yes, they carried out their work in an emotional way.

[Kryutov] And, I wonder, are there differences? Well, of course, there are differences. Well, is it possible to carry anything from the Russian Duma over to us in the Supreme Soviet. What do you think?

[Lukyanov] I think that we must think over very thoroughly, in general, about taking stock of the whole parliamentary practice of foreign countries, and of the system of Russian parliamentarism. True it was in embryonic form but it should be examined, too. Incidentally, very intelligent, very subtle legal experts elaborated the rules of the state Duma. I think that everything may be borrowed from that, except perhaps, the Duma chief of police, who had at his disposal there in the Duma 10 policemen and who could thereby exert influence on the deputies, should perhaps not be borrowed yet. [laughs]

[Kryutov] I think that our Supreme Soviet doesn't need such a thing yet.

[Lukyanov] However, here is another detail which perhaps sometimes was out of the picture. The fact of the matter is that the Supreme Soviet was permanently under the, so to speak, most attentive, fixed gaze of the people. Sometimes it literally caused heads to turn. A deputy's trenchant phrase usually encountered a whole series of all kinds of, well, responses arriving here. We received around 40,000 letters and telegrams addressed to the session. There were, of course, many letters on personal matters. But very many responses were well, indirect. A deputy would speak today and there would be a response the next day, either a positive or a negative one. Sometimes a very sharp one.

[Krutov] Could you show us a telegram?

[Lukyanov] Yes, I can get a telegram, several telegrams, some of the most recent ones. And this is interesting. You have no doubt heard that a number of deputies spoke about the fact that local soviets and employees of local soviets are petrified about the forthcoming elections, are doing nothing to improve the state of affairs in the regions, and so on. We have received masses of telegrams from local soviet employees about this matter. They openly state that yes, among us there are bureaucrats, functionaries, and people petrified by the forthcoming elections, but fundamentally the local soviet employee is a selfless worker. Moreover, as you know, their pay is not particularly high and it is very difficult to recruit employees in the regions now.

[Krutov] In Zagorsk, they still have not managed to appoint a deputy chairman.

[Lukyanov] Well, after all, what often used to happen? What often used to happen was that the local soviet employee would get all the problems dumped on him. All the problems. And so now, he reluctantly goes into such work, all the more so since he gets a lower wage than the head of a department on a farm. The whole problem lies in the need to raise his level, and so on. Here I have

several telegrams of this kind. This telegram, for example, was signed by the chairmen of the Ivano-Frankovsk, Lutsk, Lvov, (?Ruono), and Ternopol town executive committees. They write about their work and say that if the Supreme Soviet helps us as soon as possible to adopt the law on local self-management, to strengthen the material and financial base of local soviets, and to regulate their relations with enterprises in the regions, this would be the main contribution. To help the local soviet employee.

[Krutov] Power in the region is, of course, simply essential, simply essential.

[Shvedova] Anatoliy Ivanovich. I know that there were not just letters and telegrams from our Soviet people, but also that the reception department was never empty. Deputies received everyone who wished to be seen and I know that the Rossiya Hotel where the deputies lived, and the Moskva Hotel were full of people waiting to see a deputy, to speak to him, talk about problems. Approximately how many people did the reception department see during this time.

[Lukyanov] During the period of the session, the reception department received 7,500 people, 7,500. The Committee on Glasnost, Human Rights, and Appeals of Citizens worked very actively there. It has already embarked on its work. The commissions and committees established a whole schedule for the reception of the public there. And yet a great many people beseiged the Moskva Hotel with a large number of complaints. But there are various reasons for this. It seemed that the congress and the session could solve everything. But very many people came with complaints about local issues which it is impossible to resolve here. One cannot see from here how to resolve them. The second point is that a great many people were simply given the wrong reply locally, when it should have been said that this request of yours is not legitimate and should not be pursued from instance to instance. Our bureaucrat prefers to avoid this and a person goes from one instance to the next until he is told, here in Moscow, that his request is not a legitimate one. Of course, this is a very major violation of proper order. And besides this, a great mass of problems has, indeed, accumulated in society, a whole mass of difficulties, social disorders, and social injustices which must now be resolved. This has all very rapidly reared up and come pouring out now because it is that kind of time. People are demanding that these matters be resolved quickly. I believe that we would have to tackle these matters very thoroughly. One would like them, above all, to be resolved at the reception department and for deputies not to be besieged at their hotels. But, for a certain interim period, this was necessary and we had to cope with it.

There were many shortcomings here and it was discovered that the apparatus was unable to digest such a quantity of letters, when 100,000 letters arrived at once at the congress. It was impossible even to read them all at once. We will have to work on this, work very thoroughly, and answer every person. Let me say that up to 200 letters per day arrive addressed to me alone, and as for Mikhail Sergeyevich, he sometimes receives 7,000, 3,000, 5,000 letters per day. This is an enormous flow. It would seem one would like to reply to everyone. This is not always possible, but at least we will try conscientiously to deal with each letter and each person's life.

[Shvedova] Are there letters to which you respond in person?

[Lukyanov] Yes, of course. Well, I think that I deal with at least about 50 or 60 letters every evening, myself. These I myself send without fail to some bodies, or I give instructions to have them dealt with, or I have them looked into.

[Shvedova] Well, there are people behind each letter.

[Lukyanov] Yes, there is a destiny behind each letter. It is often very difficult to help a person. This is what we did to achieve this. Usually in the Supreme Soviet letters concerning pardon, citizenship, or anything to do with awards were investigated generally by commissions consisting basically of civil servants, officials of the apparatus. We set up three commissions at the Supreme Soviet, at the Supreme Soviet Presidium: the Commission on Pardons, which has now started work actively and consists solely of deputies; the Commission on Citizenship, dealing with entry and exit and questions of Soviet citizenship; and finally the Commission on Awards. Already the material which they receive, which has started reaching them, shows that deputies are being much more active in examining things, much more wholehearted in their approach to specific requests, so to speak. But they are also much stricter. Incidentally, the Commission on Pardons, the commission comprising deputies, is a very strict commission.

[Krutov] Look at what is happening, Anatoliy Ivanovich. Deputies are being more humane and more strict in their attitude toward requests than the apparatus is. But in my opinion nevertheless the apparatus of the USSR Supreme Soviet should be examined as soon as possible because the deputies have very many reproaches about the apparatus. What is your view of this problem, this issue?

[Lukyanov] Well, I am calm on this score because it would be wrong to change the whole apparatus and replace it immediately. Approximately 100 people had to be retired before the congress started work. Now we will replenish the apparatus with specialists. But in this apparatus there are completely unique specialists and it would be an outright crime to get rid of them at the moment. It will have to be restructured very thoroughly. This is an apparatus which is accustomed to short sessions and to deputies who do not come up with alternative proposals. It is accustomed to clear, calm, measured, and orderly debate. Everything must be

restructured on the spot. During this time, of course, much has changed. We have received, so to speak, very sharp criticism, just criticism. But at the same time we will try to bring this apparatus up to the necessary standard. It is still small. It must not be especially inflated. It is better to be quality-oriented.

For example, a department for interethnic relations has been set up. A department for social and economic policy. We have had to set up a new press group for the Supreme Soviet and thoroughly change the work of the department of international relations and of the department connected with local soviets. It is all only in the making. I think that the time will come when we will look at the apparatus as a whole—the Supreme Soviet Presidium has agreed to this—and will try to get it improved, although this process is very complex, very complex.

The main breakthrough has taken place. I have no doubt of that. The apparatus has started to work for the deputies, under the deputies, under their control, and not vice versa.

[Krutov] But not completely yet, I would say. Not completely.

[Lukyanov] Well, you can see better. I only think—I don't want to defend this apparatus. I do have contacts with those people, although it is the secretariat and the leadership of the secretariat, and heads of the chambers who are responsible for the work of the apparatus. The vice president has a lot of other duties. But in principle I think that this work will be very invigorating and solid. I am in general an optimist, because the apparatus is not as unsophisticated, not as faceless and backward as it sometimes seems.

[Krutov] As one always does, one judges according to the people one meets.

[Lukyanov] That's right, that's right. Just as, by the way, we judge, according to the journalists we meet, because after all we could have this conversation as deputy to deputy. [Krutov is a deputy from Zaborsk]

[Krutov] Yes we could.

[Lukyanov] I could ask you, why does it happen that our television, our radio (?latches) onto just a certain circle of deputies. And often a deputy who is very thoughtful, who perhaps doesn't often come up to the rostrum, or flaunt himself in front of the camera, a deputy in whom the greatest inner turmoil is going on, the birth of a politician, such a person still doesn't always get on television. That's also very important, it seems to me.

[Krutov] Ivan Anatolyevich [as heard], I agree. You know, journalists also try to get precisely those people who talk a lot, people who are....

[Shvedova interrupting] Popular.

[Krutov] Popular, so that...well, on the one hand it's easier to work with them, and on the other hand of course we, too, are learning. So here I am saying that if we had our own deputies' channel, not just transmissions of the sessions or the congress, but our own deputies' channel where all the deputies, any deputy, could come and say what he had to, and talk and explain his problem, and invite the heads of departments and simply discuss something, that would be marvelous.

[Lukyanov] I think that setting up a Supreme Soviet press center will indeed serve this task. And we decided at the session of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and will publish this decision in the near future, to restructure completely the work of our journal of the Soviet of People's Deputies, and indeed call it THE PEOPLE'S DEPUTY [NARODNYY DEPUTAT], so that it is a tribune, so that there is a comparison of views, and move with this toward both people and deputies, so that this is a great opportunity for all of us.

But I think that journalists, too, could do much better in seeking and choosing the most interesting individuals from the depths of the people and from the ranks of the deputies. Here, too, it is important to find the proper perspective. For example, I nearly always observe this phrase among parliamentary correspondents: From the servant of the people, the deputy is the servant of the people and as the servant of the people he should serve his constituency, and so on. And on each occasion in this instance I recall my very good friend, now deceased, the poet Vasiliy Fedorov.

[Krutov] He was a good poet.

[Lukyanov] In the past he was not too shy to write lines which were not published at first but were published later I shall give my heart and hands to the people, but please don't let them say that I am the servant of the people. Servants are forever being cunning with the boss.

I think that this is the turning point from the many promises which candidates gave, from what deputies promised, and what they are now having to do; the turning point between a deputy who defends local and sometimes departmental interests, sometimes the interests of his collective farm [kolkhoz] or enterprise, his city, or his republic, the switch to focusing on nationwide interests, from being the servant of the people to being a political figure on a nationwide scale. The turning point is here. We are witnessing this turning point. And this session of the Supreme Soviet and the congress itself are the foundations of this turning point.

[Shvedova] Now, Anatoliy Ivanovich, please say a word if you can about the legislative side of the work of the session of the Supreme Soviet. It is well known that very many documents were adopted. I am afraid to read out precisely how many but I think there are over 100. Am I right?

[Lukyanov] The Supreme Soviet adopted 98 decisions in all and 32, or rather 31 decisions were adopted by the chambers. If you look at it like this then of course these decisions were on narrow issues, not big issues but they were very major decisions, very major ones. Perhaps I can show you simply.

[Krutov] Please go ahead and let us see.

[Lukyanov] Come here and look at them. [Lukyanov shows documents] These are just the basic acts adopted by the Supreme Soviet. These are 50 of the bulletins which contain a full stenographic record of the deputies' addresses.

To speak of the draft laws that were examined by the Supreme Soviet, perhaps of the most important, key questions, it seems to me you would have to first of all name the acts dealing with economic reform and the economy. Among them, in the first place are the law on changes in the Law on State Enterprises and Associations. This is a most important, most serious act, which is the very basis of the reform.

Also among them is the law on confirming the decree on taxes on cooperatives. It was discussed for a long time. The deputies found a new angle, a new solution to this question. They have unleashed the initiative of the republics and localities, and I know that, on the basis of this decree, some speculative cooperatives have been closed in some towns. On the other hand, they have supported the cooperatives that help people, that help to develop the service domain, and so on.

[Krutov] That is to say, according to this law, the localities have more power.

[Lukyanov] It has been given to the localities. At the same time, the chance has been given to increase and support these cooperatives now working for perestroyka, working for the development of our economy.

Of course the decisions we adopted on changing over to financial autonomy in three Baltic republics are of exceptional importance. I think that this is an approach to a solution of the question of financial autonomy and self-financing of territorial units as well. There you are.

[Krutov] Anatoliy Ivanovich, excuse me, I remember this was indeed a moment when we had, one could say, a crisis situation in the Supreme Soviet, didn't we?

[Lukyanov] Any crisis is the solution of contradictions and the emergence of something new. One must have a calm attitude toward this. I think that this is an exam the Supreme Soviet passed. It was held like a Supreme Soviet, in this exam.

Now about the large group of laws that are connected with social issues. First and foremost there is the law on raising pensions to poorly paid categories of pensioners. It applies to 30 million people. If this one law was the only one adopted by the Supreme Soviet, it would still be very appreciable.

I have already spoke of the law on releasing students from military service. I have already spoken about the allocation of a large sum for medicines and for obtaining consumer goods, and so on. Of course all of this is not much. One would like a lot more, but what the Supreme Soviet could do, it has done.

That is the second group of very important legislative acts. The third group is all the acts connected with strengthening authority in the localities.

There is the appeal to the soviets, and the decision to hold extraordinary sessions in local soviets, with the executive committees reporting back. There is the appeal to the regions on the subject of strikes, like a sort of response to these strikes, where the Supreme Soviet has put in its very weighty word. And that was followed, as you know, by the first reading of the draft law on labor conflicts. It will now be called: on collective labor disputes (or conflicts)—in brackets. The first reading of this law has been held. It will be published in IZVESTIYA, and we shall reexamine it over and over again, with the participation of a large numnber of enterprises, trades unions, and so on.

The fourth such large sector in which laws and decisions were made was the strengthening of socialist legality. There is the law on the status of judges—and I must say that this is a very important legislative act, which was under preparation for a long time and was discussed by judges, and was discussed by the population. It is a law which will certainly play a great role in the independence of the courts. It is the first step in our judicial reform. Then there is the decision on setting up temporary commissions to step up the decisive fight against crime, which was adopted at the final sitting on the initiative of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev—and I can tell you that on Tuesday [9 August] we shall be gathering this commission together and it will start work. It is called a temporary committee. It will start work. It will be a serious body to coordinate all society's efforts in the fight against crime, and here we need not so much decisions as practical actions on the spot by law enforcement bodies and by the public, and by labor collectives. All of this came in the decision on legality. And during confirmation of the decree many issues of leglity were touched upon.

And finally, the last group of legislative acts was connected with the sphere of international relations. There was the ratification of three important international agreements. There were matters connected with the status of our trade missions abroad—and this decision on their status was confirmed; there was the decision

connected with confirming the decree on joint enterprises; and finally, there was the appeal to the U.S. Congress on a moratorium on nuclear explosions.

So you see how many decisions were adopted by the Supreme Soviet. But it seems to me that that is only the beginning. What will happen at the next session—and there we are concentrating mainly on legislative plan and budget work—will be much more serious.

[Krutyov] Anatoliy Ivanovich, this is what I'd like to dwell on. You know, we always—sometimes—passed good and interesting decrees. But when we started implementing them...Right?

[Lukyanov] That's absolutely right. Every old Russian justice of the peace used to have on his table a sort of green glass ruler on which were engraved the words of Peter I: "It is in vain that laws are written down if they are not implemented." So the worst tragedy in our legislative procedure, in our case, is bad work on the implementation of legislation. They know how to, they have learned to write them down—although sometimes we learned to write them in circles, so that the laws didn't have to be implemented—but we are carrying them out even worse. So the issue of monitoring the legislation, and then the way in which it is implemented at the center and locally, will be the main problem in putting perestroyka into practice. Perestroyka in the form of directives alone is just one-third of the matter; two-thirds is implementation of these directives centrally and, most importantly, locally, and this will be assisted to a considerable extent by renewal of cadres locally, which will take place in the course of the forthcoming elections, both locally and in the republics. There is no doubt that this will be the second stage, the very important second stage, of political reform in our country.

[Shvedova] Anatoliy Ivanovich, shall we go on?

[Lukyanov] Yes, let's go on.

[Shvedova] Anatoliy Ivanovich, some of the documents which we have just been looking at on the desk were created at the initiative of groups of deputies. As is known, at the session and in the committees, in the commissions of the chambers, and at plenary sessions a diversity of interests and opinions came to light among the deputies. Groups were even formed of agrarian specialists, workers, and ecologists, taking into account their own interests, and the Interregional Group was also formed. What is the significance of all these groups and what influence can they have on the effectiveness of the further work of the Supreme Soviet?

[Lukyanov] I would add that, in addition to the group of agrarian deputies, which had been formed even prior to the congress, in addition to the group of workers, which is currently a very active group, I would have to call to a kind of founding group of workers' deputies, there are also groups of teachers from higher educational establishments and schools working very actively, there is a group of young deputies, particularly those who have gone through the Afghan war—they have submitted their own proposals on bills. There are also, certainly, territorial groups, let us say regional groups according to republics, and even from individual towns, say, Leningrad. There is also the Interregional Group.

We take the same stand toward all of them: Alternative views are absolutely essential when working out decisions. Differing approaches and different views, pluralism of opinion, are essential. Without that, the normal functioning of the Supreme Soviet or of any representative body is simply unthinkable. And everything being done in that direction must be supported. However, if a group appears which considers that its main task is to express only the alternative view—and it is organized and set up to acheive this goal—that should be pondered over. In this respect, I always recall that Ivan Alekseyevich Bunin in his memoirs has a story about two landowners, his neighbors, who were reading "War and Peace". One only read about the war, and not about peace, while the other only read about peace and not about war. So it seems to me sometimes that if some of us are only going to read around problems relating to the creation of some kind of realities, so to speak, are going to create norms, and others are only going to read about the war and only present the alternative view, we will waste too much effort on this alternative view, on confrontation, instead of working together, together. This is exceptionally important now. We have noted, for example, that even the most active figures, so to speak, in the Interregional Group did not attend our sessions of the commission in which issues which had been raised by the Interregional Group itself were being discussed. In our view, we must work together as much as possible, creating from various stances new solutions, new approaches, because ultimately, in our opinion, taking the strictest view of things, and speaking about the majority of deputies, we have the same aim, the same.

The most important thing now—and you will probably have noticed that one day, after the session, I had a discussion, we had a discussion, the session ended and then a heartfelt dialogue started with deputies which sometimes lasted ½ hour, sometimes 40 minutes—is in one of these dialogues to talk about unity, about the fact that we should now consolidate society. This is esceptionally important: not to dissipate our strength but to consolidate society to the utmost now in order to deal with the tasks of perestroyka. The harder the revolutionary phase of perestroyka we are entering, the more we need to consolidate, to get together. The force of consolidation should first and foremost be the Supreme Soviet, the Congress of People's Deputies, and the soviets as a whole. Therefore, the more any group, including regional groups, works on consolidating society, on solving problems together, the better it will be. Pluralism is essential, dialogue is essential for the cause, for resolving the tasks of perestroyka.

[Krutov] Anatoliy Ivanovich, I agree that national agreement is now the most important thing.

[Yanov] National [agreement] on a general level.

[Krutov] On a general level, that is the most important thing. And yet, when taking any decision, we can't now do without alternatives. Do you agree?

[Lukyanov] I agree absolutely, but the alternatives on each decision we spoke about, already existed—they had already been submitted. Perhaps it is not right to create a special group only for alternatives, for special opponents. We must work better and together, although I don't deny the most varied possibilities. Now all healthy forces of society must work for perestroyka. We simply have no other option.

That's how it is in my opinion. But I nevertheless think that a very large, even a huge majority of deputies, support this standpoint.

[Shvedova] Anatoliy Ivanovich, to conclude our very interesting conversation today, I would like to touch on this. Time is going fast. The vacation will pass by. Vacations in general have the habit of going very fast. Although to judge from everything, the deputies won't have quiet ones. And on September 18th, the deputies will return to Moscow. The committees and commissions will start work again, and the fall session will open 25 September. Right? What will this session be like?

[Lukyanov] The main thing, of course, will be the plan and budget for 1990, because they will not be an ordinary plan and budget. It is a plan and budget for a year when we should stop, at least halt, the negative trends in the development of the economy, especially in the financial sphere, the financial improvement of our economy.

Here we do indeed have alternative solutions: What is being proposed, and how we—both the Politburo and the government—see the ways to correct the situation. Having gathered together immediately after the session we, the chairmen of the committees and commissions, agreed on how the plan and budget would be worked through, so that there wouldn't again be all that pulling and tugging in different directions, in order, in general, to find common approaches to the solution of the plan and budget for next year. This will be the first, most important question.

But after that the Supreme Soviet has already sketched out the priority legislative acts to be examined. They are the law on property, the law on land and land use, on lease relationships, the law on socialist enterprises, including cooperative enterprises here. They are the law on pensions, a general law on pensions—we had now decided on only a part. That's to say a whole series of the most important legislative acts. So we have given the deputies for their vacations rather a large pile of homework for their vacations, if I may say such a thing.

Here, have a look. I think I've put it somewhere here [Lukyanov fumbles around in bookcase behind him and gets out brochures] Ah, here they are. Here's what the deputies have got for the summer. They are taking with them regulations of the Congress of People's Deputies and of the Supreme Soviet, draft regulations, draft law on the status of people's deputies, draft law on general principles of local self-management and the local economy—that's to say, there they will have to work with the local authorities on looking at those questions—a draft law on the general principles for the management of the economy and social sphere in the union republics—the biggest, most important law, maybe for the perestroyka of our economy, a law on the quality of production, on the activity of inventors, bases for criminal legislation, bases for legislation on the court system, draft law on changes in the procedures and scale of taxation of the population. The deputies have taken all this with them.

[Krutov, laughing] Anatoliy Ivanovich, what kind of vacation can we be talking about then?

[Lukyanov] You began our talk on the subject of vacations. But in principle I believe that it is the kind of task that I think is very important for the deputies to work through at home, with their voters. It is natural that the deputies should come back, having absorbed the experience of their voters, the opinions of their voters, better prepared for this work. Then the session itself should go over to the congress. The Congress of People's Deputies will be like a second congress, concluding all this work. The main questions there will doubtless be the question of the constitution, of changes in the constitution, the adoption of the regulations, of the law on the status of deputies. But it seems to me that the most important question will be that of the development of our economy in this 5-year plan and in the longer term, the improvement of our economy.

So we have before us a lot of serious work, which will be the linking of our perestroyka in the sphere of political work, political reform, with economic reform. It is only when democracy is tightly linked with the economy, when it influences the economy, as Lenin wrote, and itself comes under the influence of economic development, that perestroyka will gain ever greater speed.

We are in a complex, difficult stage of perestroyka. No one in the Central Committee or in the Supreme Soviet denies these difficulties. All this was felt very keenly. The deputies brought this experience from the local areas. They themselves took part in the solution of conflicts, including conflicts connected with strikes, with national contradictions, or interethnic relations, in a period that was difficult in principle.

But I should like to say yet again that the Supreme Soviet, as a continuation of the congress, as our Soviet parliament, was held. Yes, we have only laid the foundations of its work, but this foundation is a sound one, and there is no doubt that we have good prospects for the

development of this work of the Supreme Soviet so that the supreme body of power in the country should have the maximum influence on perestroyka as a whole. There, that's all I have been able to tell you today, comrades.

[Krutov] Thank you, Anatoliy Ivanovich, for the interview.

[Shvedova] Thank you. [end recording]

Late July Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reviewed
PM0708113589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[Viktor Khatuntsev report under the rubric "Parliamentary Week": "By the Right of Authority"]

[Text] This week in parliament started with a discussion of emergency events—the miners' strike, on which the Supreme Soviet had received information not only from newspapers or the "Vremya" program, but also from people's deputies directly participating in dialogues with the miners.

The evidence of eyewitnesses was, I would say, journalistically sharp and impassioned. Too many acute problems have built up in the mining towns.

Monday's [24 July] discussion of this current subject revealed what is an important aspect of our parliament's work—its swift reaction to the changing political situation in the country and its influence on the search for solutions. This is a very substantive feature of the qualitative modernization of the sphere of state administration. Power in the Kremlin is now wielded by the full representatives of the people, who do not wait for anyone's instructions or permission. Incidentally, this turbulent and explosive trend in our life is forcing us to act and make decisions.

The deputies did not restrict themselves to discussing the serious position in the country. An appeal to the Soviet people was adopted Tuesday. It expressed support and understanding for the working people's legitimate demands, and stated that the Supreme Soviet compels the union government to immediately resolve these most urgent problems. It compels it.... Special emphasis should be placed on that word in the document. Having created a strong and competent body of supreme power in a relatively short period, the people are increasingly convinced of the weakness of local authorities.

That is why there was repeated mention during the general policy discussion of the need for elections to local soviets to be held as quickly as possible. People's Deputy Yu.V. Golik of Kemerovo, giving this November as the latest date for the elections, said: "It has often been said that we need to hand power over to the soviets, to hand power to local areas; what have the workers done? They have proved the old, well-known thesis that power is not given, it is taken; they have gone out and taken power into their own hands. Nobody anywhere now opposes soviet power. They oppose entirely specific, definite leaders who have failed to cope...."

People's Deputy V.I. Kirillov of Voronezh believes that current soviet members are demoralized by the fear that they will not be reelected at the next elections, and therefore they are doing nothing. It is impossible to "revive" them. However, it would be naive to expect fundamental perestroyka from new soviets without guaranteeing their right to full power locally. That is why Kirillov and a number of other participants in the discussion see the adoption of legislative acts on elections to local soviets, on local self-management, and on land use—in general, the creation of a legal basis which could guarantee the effectiveness of new local soviets—as a priority.

The appeal to the Soviet people cited the priority avenues of legislative activity. These include precisely those laws which will ensure genuine independence and self-management by labor collectives, the right of enterprises to enjoy the results of their own work, the transfer of land to peasants in practice, and the sovereignty and economic accountability of republics, and will create the conditions for the democratic election of representatives of the people to local and republic organs of power and for the protection of each citizen's rights and freedoms. As we can see, the program for the rest of the current and forthcoming fall sessions is clear-cut and linked with the problems of our difficult everyday life.

On Wednesday debates began in the Supreme Soviet on a draft law which can hardly leave anyone complacent. The USSR draft law "On the Economic Independence of the Lithuanian and Estonian Soviet Socialist Republics" was submitted to the country's parliamentarians on the instructions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. And there must be no delay in making decisions: If there is to be a transfer to economic accountability it will take effect 1 January 1990. It is not just Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, which had previously stated its intentions, that are preparing to switch to the principles of economic accountability, but also Moscow, Sverdlovsk Oblast, and Tartaria; the question of economic accountability in the Kuzbass and Kuybyshev Oblast has been raised. Are these the planned vanguards of breakthroughs on the economic front?

Both the tactics and strategy of the expected offensive were analyzed by deputies with particular passion when there were clashes between different views and opinions. The tension of the debates was entirely understandable—after all, it was essentially a question of a new model of socialism and a new state and economic system for our union. Clearly, in the serious and unsteady situation in which our national economy has long found itself, the aims of perestroyka will not be achieved without taking some new steps. However, the doubt in the minds of those deputies who are scared about virtual

total chaos and economic collapse following the economy's partitioning into regional "domains" is understandable, too. This is a most fundamental question for the country's future.

Deputy S.S. Alekseyev virtually predetermined the fate of the final decision in his speech. Expressing ardent support for the Baltic republics' proposal, he nonetheless proposed adopting the law only on first reading, since from the legal standpoint it still contains many points that need further work and coordination with other laws currently under preparation.

Approval by the supreme organ of power for an idea which has long excited not just the economists and inhabitants of the Baltic republics, but the country's entire public, is of enormous importance for the country's future.

The republics' independence in resolving certain problems of their development is already making itself felt. For instance, during the discussion of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree "On the Payment of Income Tax by Cooperatives" Finance Minister V.S. Pavlov said that the right of assessing cooperatives' activity from the standpoint of the application of tax rates had been handed over to the union republics. And in most republics where corresponding decrees have been adopted preference has been given to cooperatives providing services for the unemployed or working on the basis of state prices. On the other hand, rates have been sharply increased for cooperatives which act as intermediaries reselling resources they have bought. And such measures are entirely understandable. Out of their total profit of R4.3 billion in the first quarter cooperatives contributed just R96 million—or 3 percent—to the state budget, whereas state enterprises hand over 38 percent of their income. There should be justice!

As is well known, 18 decrees have been submitted for examination by the Supreme Soviet. Considerable time was devoted to them last week. And although certain decrees were ratified relatively quickly, the content of some of them prompted turbulent exchanges of opinions. As for the decree on the taxation of cooperatives, its discussion will be continued Monday.

Supreme Soviet Proceedings Highlighted

PM2807135389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[Miroslav Buzhkevich "Publicist's Notes": "The Week in Parliament"]

[Text] Last Monday, 17 July, was the last day in the 3-week government formation marathon. For the first time the creation of the country's supreme executive organ of power was a stern test for those aspiring to state posts, a test which, as is known, not all of them were destined to pass. More than 10 vacancies remain in the government. But the quality of the selection more than makes up for this lacuna.

The new government is more capable than the old one, many members of the Supreme Soviet believe. It is particularly gratifying to see in it relatively young people who have great potential for establishing modern methods of government and for developing the country's national economy. V. Shcherbakov, 40-year-old chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, who presented to the Supreme Soviet an interesting program for the solution of labor and social problems, based on a systematic analysis, is certainly one of them.

The debate on the formation of the government was a useful grounding in parliamentarianism for the people's deputies as well. They obtained important knowledge of the state of affairs in the economy and in culture, which helped to give them a full appreciation of the complexity and contradictoriness of the current period in the country's life.

The second plenary sitting of the Supreme Soviet on Wednesday 19 July was devoted to organizing the implementation of the assignments it had been given by the Congress of People's Deputies. It began with a discussion of the political situation that arose in the Kuzbass and Donbass as a result of the strikes at mines and a number of other enterprises. M.S. Gorbachev, who was in the chair, while noting the gravity of the situation, said that the workers are resolutely in favor of continuing the reforms and perestroyka itself. They are rightly demanding enterprises' economic independence in order to have the opportunity to increase revenue through their own labor, which will be channeled into raising pay and solving social problems. But the stoppages at mines and other enterprises have far-reaching economic, social, and political consequences. Our aim is to proceed along the road of transformations, tackle urgent issues more dynamically, and ensure higher labor productivity and economic efficiency.

There was a vigorous discussion of the report by A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on carrying out the assignments of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. A number of USSR Supreme Soviet resolutions was adopted, including one on the procedure for media coverage of the Supreme Soviet's work, for which a special press center is being set up.

Last week, the fourth since the Supreme Soviet sittings resumed, 3 days were given over to the work of its committees and commissions. Their great potential and wide range of interests was immediately apparent. Naturally, their attention was focused on the discussion of decrees and draft laws which are to be approved by the

USSR Supreme Soviet. They include the draft law submitted ny the USSR Council of Ministers and All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions on the procedure for resolving collective labor disputes (it has already been proposed that the word "social" should be added to its name), laws on quality, taxation, land use, and a number of others.

The first parliamentary hearing was also held. The Committees for Questions of Ecology and Rational Use of Natural Resources; for Science, Public Education, Culture, and Upbringing; and for Defense and State Security Questions discussed the tragic events at the defense enterprise near Chelyabinsk 32 years ago. Representatives of the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry and Ministry of Health and the Kurchatov Institute and well-known scientists participated in the debate. Zh. Medvedev—one of the top people at the London Institute for Medical Research and author of the book "The Nuclear Disaster in the Urals"—was also invited to the hearing. Future hearings of this type will dicuss the Chernobyl disaster and its aftermath, nuclear power stations, underground explosions, and others. All this is regarded as preparation for the very important law on nuclear safety.

The Commission for Transport, Communications, and Information Science Questions familiarized itself with a letter from a group of scientists about how to achieve a fundamental breakthrough in money supply and reduction of the state budget deficit. The authors propose accelerating conversion in the defense industry by expanding consumer goods production. They also deem it necessary to perform an investment maneuver, channeling considerable funds into the development of group "B" enterprises by cutting appropriations for heavy industry. This would be combined with a drastic reduction in the number of construction sites of which there are currently around 300,000 in the country. Finally, in the view of the letters' authors, in the very near future there will have to be a sharp increase in consumer goods imports.

The Committee for the Affairs of Women and of Family, Mother, and Child Protection and the Commission for Labor, Prices, and Social Policy Questions took an important step. At the moment mothers get paid leave after the birth of a child until that child is 18 months old. The committee and commission sent to the USSR Council of Ministers a valid proposal on introducing a further period of unpaid leave for mothers until the child is three, this period to be regarded as part of their service.

The committees' and commissions' work is taking place not only within the walls of the Supreme Soviet and not only in the capital. Last week Deputies V. Korobkov, Yu. Nugis, S. Korneva, and R. Ten, members of the Commission for Consumer Goods, Trade, and Municipal, Consumer, and Other Services to the Population, went to Novomoskovsk. They were there to check on the way Ministry of the Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry enterprises are implementing the decisions by the former Supreme Soviet Commission for Goods and Services on the Ministry of the Chemical Industry's work on increasing consumer goods production.

So the committees and commissions set about their work with a vengeance. Then obstacles immediately appeared, inhibiting their activities. A number of organizational matters has not yet been resolved. The committees' and commissions' budget has not been set (incidentally, there were proposals at the session on the need to approve the budget and staffs of the Supreme Soviet apparatus and leaders of its administrations and departments). At times it is difficult to establish where and when a particular commission or committee is meeting. Deputies complain about how poor the USSR Supreme Soviet library is. In particular, some of them wanted to find out about the practice of foreign countries' parliaments, but they were presented with obsolete materials.

Commenting on this and other observations, Yu. Ryzhov, chairman of the Committee for Science, Public Education, Culture, and Upbringing, said:

"Some call it 'teething troubles.' I believe we are reaping the fruits of neglect of procedural and technical and organizational matters."

It is estimated that the USSR Supreme Soviet session has 2 weeks to go. Two weeks of hard work by the people's deputies, but work that is essential to the country. One would like it to bear substantial fruit.

Formation of New USSR Government Assessed
18001407 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Jul 89 First Edition p 3

[Article by S. Karkhanin: "Decisive Vote"]

[Text] "All kinds of political labels have been put on the new Supreme Soviet by those who like to show off with a catchy phrase in their interviews and speeches! It has been called the 'Stalin-Brezhnev' one, and the one that 'protects the interests of the apparatus only.' This is zealously done mainly by the people whose hopes of getting elected to this body did not come true: Apparently, the fable about the fox and the grapes has not become obsolete.... However, we, the voters, will evaluate the Supreme Soviet on what it has done rather than on someone s words. Now that it has formed a government which is called upon to advance the economic reform I think that the people's deputies should feel particularly responsible for the right to live better, which our people have suffered for, to be finally implemented." [Signed] G. Kolomiytsev, Kostroma

In the Kremlin, debates on candidates for government positions have come to an end. Discussions in the permanent commissions of chambers and committees of the Supreme Soviet lasted 5 days. The texts of stenographic records, records of conversations in notebooks

and on dictaphone tapes are available which still keep the heat of polemics characteristic of the discussions. That is to say, information for reflections on the civic interpretation of the duty of deputies is available.

The situation in which the government with its new composition and structure has assumed power is very complicated. Some processes of economic and socio-political development have become more acute. The consumer market is off balance. The state of affairs with finances gives rise to concern. The problem of social justice has become truly vital.

The toilers expect not only the strategic tasks but also those of today to be solved. This is why the role of the current session, which transplants the political reform from the sphere of ideas and theoretical treatises into the area of practice is particularly significant. A real step has been taken toward transferring the power to the soviets, toward every person, every social group being able to influence the socio-political life of the country either directly or through their representatives in the Supreme Soviet.

First, let us talk about the new composition of the government. An analysis of the list of ministers helps to understand the principles on the basis of which it has been formed. One of the principles is the "tugboat" principle: A consolidated ministry is headed by the leader of the industry among those merged in which the situation has been better than in the rest of them. The appointment of N. Pugin to the Minavtoselkhozmash [Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building], of E. Pervyshin to the Minsvyazi [Ministry of Communications] and S. Kolpakov to the Minmetallurgii [Ministry of Metallurgy] have been dictated by this quite sound logic. The potential of all of them is easy to judge from their past work. Thus, before S. Kolpakov came to head the Minchermet [Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy], the industry was experiencing a crisis: For 20 years in a row, the ministry had failed to fulfill the state plan; half the enterprises generated nothing but losses. At present, ferrous metallurgy is on the upswing: Production indicators have improved sharply, and social problems are being solved successfully.

Several ministers have retained their old posts. However, there is a characteristic feature in this. Virtually all of these people have been working in the government for a comparatively short period of time: Ye. Chazov in the Minzdrav [Ministry of Health], V. Bakatin in the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], G. Yagodin in the Goso-brazovaniye [State Committee for Education]. However, they have already shown themselves to be proponents of new, non-standard methods and approaches in their style of leadership.

The third group of members of the new composition of the government consists of people who have not held major state positions previously. These are prominent scientists capable of harnessing the mighty scientific potential accumulated by entire collectives of researchers for serving the practice. They are L. Abalkin, chairman of the Goskomles [State Committee for Forestry]; A. Isayev; V. Pavlov, minister of finance, doctor of economic sciences.... Their names are widely known among specialists. Perhaps, there is no need to explain in detail why at the turning point in the development of our country an "administrative-scientific" alliance in the government is necessary. Amateurism, arbitrariness, and neglect for the objective laws of economics and politics cost too much.

What about those who have not received a vote of confidence from the people's deputies? Apparently, in the course of designating them the Council of Ministers failed to take into account how much the requirements for future ministers have increased. They are not forgiven for either past miscalculations or the shortage of highly up-to-date, constructive ideas. Judging by conversations in the permanent commissions, not all the candidates understood this. A remark by L. Rozenova, chairman of the permanent Commission of the Soviet of the Union for the Issues of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy addressed to the contender for the post of Goskomtsen [State Committee for Prices] is memorable: "We do not play politics here but rather assert the people's power. The people's power must be demanding."

An important aspect—the chairman of the Council of Ministers agreed with virtually all preliminary recommendations of the deputy commissions regarding the candidates to government posts and is not showing initiative in seeing to it that the contenders who have not gained support in these commissions are still considered in the Supreme Soviet. This position of the government may be viewed exactly as a sign of respect for the representatives of the legislative authority which is assuming traits and qualities which are new in principle. Only a coordinated effort of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers is capable of making the economic and political reforms dynamic. Those who believe that the function of the legislators is to merely "oversee" the ministries are undoubtedly mistaken. Working together and being responsible to the people together as well are in store for all of them.

Certainly, every deputy has been guided by the experience of his life and work and instructions from his constituents in raising his credentials. Yet, the issue of why a deputy has voted in a particular way is more complicated than it seems.

Writes E. Tikhonenkov from Simferopol: "First let us figure out what exactly we have to evaluate in discussing a candidacy. It appears to me that it is the feeling of responsibility, competence, and organizational abilities." V. Kisin from Moscow writes: "As I see it, first of all we need to evaluate the professionalism of a contender." V. Yudin from Magadan Oblast writes: "It hardly makes sense to discuss the personal traits of the candidates, as we know little about them. It is more

useful to discuss non-standard ways of developing a [particular] industry which can be monitored. It gives rise to concern that not all of the candidates have indicated such ways, though they know the situation at this or that plant down to minute details. Is this not the result of ministers resolving issues which are one order of magnitude below the ones they should be resolving?"

Still, we cannot make an absolutely definitive statement that principles rather than persons were discussed. People's deputies themselves explain the motives for their decisions, including quite complicated ones. I. Bisher, deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities: "I have voted in favor of L. Abalkin, though I do not agree with many of his positions. However, as a prominent scientist he will be able to understand the arguments of his opponents. We will argue and arrive at compromises together." Yu. Shcherbak from Kiev: "It was not easy for me to vote against Yu. Izrael. Personally, I believe that Yuriy Antoniyevich is the best candidate for the position of Goskomgidromet [State Committee for Hydrometeorology] chairman, but the constituents have given me a written instruction to ensure his removal. They believe that Yu. Izrael was not persistent in making all the data on the Chernobyl accident available to the public." A. Korshunov from Tashkent: "At the session, I was one of the two who voted against I. Belousov. As an aviation industry employee, I believe that Igor Sergeyevich was not entirely objective in telling the deputies about the state of affairs in the industry." V. Belov from Vologda: "I was one of the few on the agrarian committee to vote against P. Polad-Zade. I am sure that, as the first deputy minister of the former Minvodkhoz [Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources] he is fully responsible for the harm inflicted on nature by infamous land reclamation."

Nonetheless, a system has emerged from the mosaic of opinions which administers a comprehensive test of strength to the proposals of the government. I believe that its essence has been precisely formulated by E. Pervyshin to whom we talked while the subject was still fresh—right after Erlen Kirikovich successfully passed a quite strict interview at the permanent Commission of the Soviet of the Union for Transportation and Communications:

"You see, previously the advancement of an individual one step higher on the service ladder usually depended on a single person, as a rule, two steps above you. Later, many people got to sign the papers, but still the decision belonged to one person. If you met his requirements you were going to be all right. At present there are 542 deputies in the Supreme Soviet, and all have a decisive vote. The difference is tremendous!"

Indeed, the Supreme Soviet and permanent commissions of the chambers, in the words of N.I. Ryzhkov, directly challenged the "office" methods of forming a government. The chairman of the Council of Ministers acknowledged this to be correct. It was resolved to invite deputies from relevant permanent commissions and managers of major production associations for consultations on future candidates for the vacant posts of ministers. "In this manner, the most worthy contenders will be selected," noted Nikolay Ivanovich in an interview given to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

We must say bluntly that at times both the dogmatic and the "radical left" approaches surfaced in the course of debate at the session. However, in fairness to the deputies, these approaches were rebuffed in a timely and resolute manner. It is instructive that, as a rule, the proponents of views objectively not promoting perestroyka ultimately themselves recognized such views to be erroneous. This is how collective wisdom promoted the search for truth.

The skill of thinking and making decisions in terms of state.... It is being sharpened in the course of routine parliamentary work, and, as any skill, it does not come immediately. As if under a magnifying glass, the lack of political culture became particularly apparent in discussions, for inculcating which, however, previously there was no place and also no reason. Much was said about it at the Congress of People's Deputies, and rightly so. At the session as well, the presidium was compelled to correct the course of debate from time to time. Members of the Supreme Soviet are both the instructors and the students at these lessons.

I would like to quote several remarks made on the floor and in the lobby rather than in the presidium. "The session should not be turned into a production planning meeting." "We have already learned to talk, but we still do not know how to keep silent when you've got nothing to say." "Why are the same people asking the same questions?" "Everyone of us has got to discharge his responsibilities to his constituents at his place."

It makes sense to comment on the last remark in particular. It became known that Deputy A. Obolenskiy is now demanding persistently that he be given an opportunity to live and work in Moscow, though he was not elected to the Supreme Soviet. What is it—an attempt to become a professional politician?... What do they think about the efforts of Aleksandr Mitrofanovich in the Polar Institute of Geophysics of the Kola Research Center, where he holds the position of a design engineer?

A. Lemnev, sector chief, says: "In the last 4 months, I have seen him twice, 5 minutes at a time. Meanwhile, he is a specialist whom we very much need. Where is Obolenskiy at present? I do not know, perhaps, in Moscow...."

One tends to think that the voters will not fail to inquire with their deputy about the motives for his actions. Incidentally, this case is an exception rather than the rule. A USSR people's deputy should permanently work next to his constituents rather than "go to the people" from time to time.

The restructuring of economic arrangements based on a variety of forms of social property, reinforcement of the socialist principle of distribution, formation of a regulated market—these are at present the main tasks of ministries which are becoming the headquarters of industries of a new type. However, while delegating to the field some of the rights previously belonging exclusively to the center we should not forget about "delegating responsibilities" as well. In other words, having received an opportunity to act more independently, the republic ministries and local soviets will now be fully responsible to their population for the decisions they make.

Perhaps, at present it would be too presumptuous to sum up any results of the events unfolding in the Kremlin. We yet have to comprehend them, because this is the first experience of that kind for all of us. Some things still cannot be evaluated unambiguously. Many discussions are still in store for us. However, I think that we cannot fail to quote one more response to a question by journalists. Immediately after a regular meeting of the session, we asked Nikolay Ivanovich whether it was easier for the government to work with the old or the current composition of the Supreme Soviet. We admit to having thought: As little as a year ago, the chairman of the Council of Ministers who named a contender would not have had to be nervous—an entire thicket of hands raised "in favor" would have gone up immediately....

Nikolay Ivanovich apparently understood that his answer was going to be unexpected for us, and suddenly smiled:

"Still, I am sure that we are going to have it easier with this Supreme Soviet. Why? Because the people's deputies will be able to help us by specific deeds and balanced, thought-through decisions."

Therefore, the current session became "an exam" for the candidate ministers. Its result is the confidence in the government, which has become qualitatively new in its composition, structure, tasks, and methods, expressed by the people through their plenipotentiary representatives. "However, no matter who we elect, things will hardly get off the ground until all the people, everyone in his own place, really get to work. We, the deputies, should help in this sparing no effort, especially at the local level," said Deputy A. Dzhasanbayev from the speaker's stand.

As they put it, you cannot say it any better. Every day of the session confirms that the credentials for decisive votes have been handed to worthy people. Their civic interpretation of the duty of deputies is found in a search for the ways of enhancing perestroyka, that is, helping their great country fully take advantage of the potential of our political system.

Deputies Comment on Supreme Soviet Session

18001369 Moscow TRUD in Russian
14 Jul 89 p 1

[Article by special correspondent V. Karpov: "The Selection of a Goal: Notes From a Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] In front of the hall entrance the deputies who are not members of the Supreme Soviet but are coming to participate in the session's work are being registered at little tables. For example, V. Gorokhov, director of the Losinyy Ostrov National Park, is registering. He has come to the meeting in order to consult with the deputies. I see my old friend, builder N. Travkin. He is now a student at the Moscow Higher Party School. He is always eager to be in touch with journalists.

"What brings you to the Kremlin, to the session, this time, Nikolay Ilich?"

"I came at the request of my electorate, I want to meet with V. Bakatin, minister of internal affairs. This is the situation. In the village of Levonikha, Shchelkovskiy Rayon, near Moscow, a certain well-known public figure buried his close relative. It would seem, well, what of it? If only there had not been such pomposity and obvious indiscretion in its organization. In a simple village graveyard, next to the graves of servicemen and pilots, an enormous area is fenced off with an elaborate memorial erected. To put it mildly, this caused misunderstanding on the people's part. Moreover, the grave is guarded by policemen 24 hours a day: one during the day and two at night, weekdays, weekends, and holidays. A radio patrol car is at the ready. The residents don't understand why the people's police are guarding a private grave at the people's expense. And I don't either."

The discussion of candidates for ministerial posts continued while we talked. It was noticeable that both the claimants themselves and the deputies participating in the "public examination" of the departmental leaders certainly shared two problems: the social sphere and ecology. Living standards, pensions, labor security, and the purity of the surrounding air—these are more and more frequently under discussion. Taking the opportunity, I asked Nikolay Ilich what he himself thinks of this.

"We will not save nature as long as no one is concerned. We are now worried; we make noises about the rivers and lakes, but this is most frequently on the level of emotion. But until theses noises take on substance, nothing will change. Today, at the enterprises, they can react calmly: 'Imagine that, two excess discharges.' As far as the social sphere is concerned...people must be paid more, they must really be cared for. I often hear the assertion that there are fewer goods in the country than there is money. But I myself don't know a single person who would turn down a raise of 100-200 on the basis on having nothing to spend it on. And look at the statistics; our proportion of consumption and savings is one to

four. As far as I know, there is no other country with such a gap. On the other hand, we have always been in the habit of saying, and we continue to say, 'Here man comes above all else!'"

"But the trade unions must have their say here...."

"Yes, but they must undergo changes, too. Today, in my view, the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] has crushed the branch central committees under it, has depersonalized them. It seems to me that structural changes are needed...."

During a recess, I meet with A. Isayev, a candidate for the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee for Forestry.

"When will they be discussing you?"

"Any day now, I think, but it's not clear; you see, sometimes the discussion can be unpredictably prolonged. "

"How do you regard the upcoming discussion?"

"To be frank, I'm a bit afraid. I'm human. It's not a simple thing to stand before the deputies at the tribune."

"What primary question do you expect to hear?"

"I think, 'When will the forest have reliable protection?'"

"That is indeed a topical issue. We just returned from a trip to Baykal. How much of the forest has been felled and then thrown into the rivers along the roads! We had to see exactly the same picture near Bratsk. It is typical for our country. Do you see any concrete alternative?"

"I have a program of activity for the post of chairman. I feel that we must develop leasing relations and cooperation in the forest economy as broadly and quickly as possible. But here the strongest pressure of the departments is perceptible. Even this can be explained: New economic relations force a real price to be fixed for the currently neglected and undervalued lumber."

It was not made known at the meeting who had become the candidate for the post of chairman of the State Committee for the Protection of Nature. The post has remained vacant up to this time.

"And we cannot, for the time being, name a candidate," as A. Yablokov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Issues of the Ecology and Rational Utilization of Natural Resources, said of the problem which has arisen. "We discussed five or six people, but have not made a final selection."

"Whom would you like to see heading the committee?"

"It must be a specialist who deals with the problems of the ecology, a good leader, and a man of principle."

"Will the committee be removed from subordination to the Council of Ministers and transferred to the Supreme Soviet?"

"It is to be hoped, but there is no possibility at this time since a multitude of problems must be solved all at once. After all, for example, at the same time, the organs of statistics must be transferred to the Supreme Soviet."

"What can you say about the discussion taking place?"

"I like it. It seemed to me that in the beginning the government was a bit afraid of deputy control, maybe it didn't trust us, but now it sees more and more partners in us."

...A regular group of candidates gathered in a passageway next to the hall. This time, USSR Procurator General A. Sukharev has called in his "team." The composition of his deputies and the member of the collegium of the USSR Procuracy must be confirmed.

A. Sukharev explains, "These are people well disposed toward perestroyka. In my view, they are good specialists; I am going to talk about that now at the meeting."

"In your view, what will the upcoming discussion be like?"

"I think it will be stormy."

Among the aspirants to the post of deputy procurator general is V. Andreyev. A question for him:

"Do you have a program for future activity?"

"Not yet, since I don't know what issues I will answer for if I am selected today. But if I am entrusted with general supervision, meaning ecological matters, then I will first and foremost direct my attention to strengthening legality. Now, for example, an enterprise without pollution control equipment can be operational. Can this be right?"

A. Sukharev's prediction was justified. The discussion was indeed stormy and pointed.

And it went on for 2 days. Such nit-picking and hairsplitting on the part of the deputies is, in my view, completely explainable and sensible. After all, they are selecting not only the leader of this or that branch, but at the same time, a program of change in the branch; the path along which perestroyka must go. And the deputies are showing preference for precisely those candidates who clearly see the goal and orient themselves on the betterment of people's lives.

S. Umalatova, USSR people's deputy and brigadier of a combined brigade of the Krasnyy Molot machinebuilding plant in Groznyy, said that "I was at home this week, meeting with workers. The wish they expressed was this: more concrete solutions."

Well, many join in that imperative. And the conditions of openness and democratic discussion of the most pointed issues at the session which, admittedly, we had long hoped to see, will allow our parliament to rise to the people's wishes.

It is too bad that on other days, very few deputies come to the meetings. This interferes with the normal process of the session's work, and seems to lower its intellectual potential.

Situation 'Tense' in Abkhaziya; Passes Introduced

LD0808131689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1245 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Sukhumi, 8 August (Gruzinform-TASS)—More than 20 firearms have been confiscated and 166 people arrested for having broken the special regime regulations during the past few days in the Abkhaz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic.

According to data from the temporary press center of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs in Abkhaziya, the situation in the autonomous republic is tense. In Ochamchirskiy Rayon a number of enterprises and state and collective farms are on strike. Individual institutions, mines, enterprises, and transport are not functioning in the town of Tkvarcheli. As of 10 August, new passes for movement around the town are being introduced to ensure the strictest possible observance of the regime in Abkhaziya, with another pass valid for the whole territory.

The situation is under the control of the law enforcement bodies.

Renewed Violence Reported

PM0808162489 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Aug 89 Morning Edition p 6

[GRUZINFORM-TASS report: "Regarding Events in Abkhazia"]

[Text] Sukhumi, 8 Aug—A shot which rang out yesterday in the dead of night in the city's densely populated Lechkobskoye Plato residential district again filled the hearts of many Sukhumi inhabitants with fear. The person guilty of this gross violation of the special regime for citizens' conduct was unable to evade the patrol detail composed of subunits of USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Forces. He turned out to be one of the escapees from the Zugdidi investigation detention center for especially dangerous criminals. The autonomous republic's law-enforcement organs have had to reinforce highway checkpoints, and the militia helicopters patrolling every corner of the city and its environs have become more frequent.

In the past 24 hours more than 20 firearms have been seized and 166 people detained for breaching the regime. Two new sorts of passes are being introduced from 10 August to ensure the strictest compliance with the special regime on the territory of the Abkhaz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]: A pass authorizing movement within the city and a pass valid for the entire territory of the Abkhaz ASSR.

An informational report from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs' temporary press center in Abkhazia offers scant comfort: The sociopolitical situation in the autonomous republic remains tense. The situation in Ochamchirskiy Rayon, where a strike by the collective of a mixed-feed plant and certain other enterprises and state and collective farms continues, is particularly difficult.

The atmosphere in the mining city of Tkvarcheli is uneasy. A number of enterprises, mines, and establishments, as well as transport, are not operating there.

Party and soviet organs of the autonomous republic are continuing to work actively to reconcile the Abkhazian and Georgian sections of the population. In the village of Tamysh, for example, a gathering of local inhabitants has been held to discuss questions connected with normalizing the situation.

Reports of 'Oppressing' of Uzbeks Prompt Protests

PM0908084989 Moscow TRUD in Russian 9 Aug 89 p 4

[D. Demidov report under the rubric "It Is Said That...": "It Happened One Evening"]

[Text] Our stringer A. Doronin has reported from Tashkent that rallies are being prepared in the city prompted by stubbornly circulating rumors that Moscow is allegedly "oppressing" people of Uzbek nationality. The main example cited by the rally organizers is an alleged case of the "beating of around 100 Uzbeks who were at the Likhachev Car Plant to gain practical experience."

We asked V. Oskochinskiy, acting chief of the capital's Lyublinskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Administration, to explain the situation:

"The car plant?" he inquired. "Beatings? It was the other way around—there was a blatant violation of public order...

"...It happened on the evening of 8 July. Two guys—Uzbeks from the Moscow Car Plant named for the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [AZLK] Hostel—were walking with a girl near the 'Tula' Movie

Theater. They were approached by four very drunk men who started insulting them. It is hard to say how things would have ended had one of the insulted parties not run to the hostel to get 'help' from his fellow-countrymen working at the plant. There were soon more than 100 people around the movie theater armed with sticks, chains, and—some of them—with knives. The four hooligans, of course, had disappeared. However, the crowd's dander was up, and they started smashing kiosk windows and breaking up newsstands... They encountered some guys who lived in the vicinity. They were beaten up and one received a knife wound. The AZLK workers did not respond to the militia appeals for them to calm down and disperse. A special-purpose militia detachment had to be called in. It drove the rampaging young people back to the hostel and forced them inside. But, having locked themselves inside the building, the rioters started throwing furniture, fire extinguishers—anything they had on hand—out of the windows... The secretary of Lyublinskiy CPSU Rayon Committee [raykom], the leaders of the rayon internal affairs administration, representatives of the Prosecutor's Office and the Moscow City Internal Affairs Administration, and staffers from the Uzbek Permanent Mission went to the scene of the incident.

"Lieutenant Colonel of the Militia A. Kormilitsin, chief of Lyublinskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Administration; Raykom Secretary N. Kalmykova, and others went into the hostel for talks. They were locked in the Red Reading Room and told that they would not be released until they 'handed over the man who ordered nightsticks to be used.' I would note that the use of special means was entirely justified and even necessary in this instance. The 'hostages,' incidentally, were released after 3 hours of talks, and the conflict was over by 0200.

"We are now trying to find the four drunks; criminal proceedings should be instituted against them. At the same time, charges of hooliganism and resisting militia workers have been brought. A specially created group from the Lyublinskiy Rayon Prosecutor's Office will carry out the investigation. The investigation is continuing, therefore I cannot name any names. I would also admit that the rumors may have been caused by one of the rioters finding it useful to present the incident as an 'ethnic conflict' and himself as a victim. Yet this was ordinary hooliganism, of which there are regrettably plenty of examples in our rayon. And public order is violated both by local inhabitants and by the workers from Uzbekistan."

A. Fazylbekov, Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic permanent representative in Moscow, stated his opinion on the incident:

"This sort of thing can quite easily happen anywhere, in any republic, and membership of whatever ethnic group has nothing to do with it. But I do have some reqeusts for the AZLK leaders. They have invited the sons of Uzbekistan—who have been raised under quite different conditions—to work in their plant without helping them to adapt to life in a big and strange city..."

Tibilisi Investigators Find Army Acts 'Unlawful'

LD0908094489 Moscow TASS in English 0918 GMT 9 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—A group of Georgian investigators have concluded that the April 9 clashes in Tbilisi were provoked by calls at an unsanctioned rally for Georgian secession from the Soviet Union, the MOSCOW NEWS weekly reports today.

The Republican leadership and the Army are also singled out for criticism, the paper reveals.

The rally, organised by informal associations outside Tbilisi Government House, resulted in disruptions of transport and some state and public organisations and in breaches of public order.

But it is emphasised that the rally was of peaceful nature and was not directly connected with the threat of use violence for the purpose of overthrowing the Soviet Government.

Having analysed the way in which a decision to put an end to the rally was made, the group, a subcommission of the investigatory group set up by the republican Supreme Soviet, concluded that the use of force was prompted by an erroneous evaluation by the Republic's leadership of the socio-political processes taking place in Georgia.

The growth of mass movements was viewed as an attempt by informal associations and extremist groups to destabilise the situation and seize political power and as anti-Soviet and anti-socialist actions.

Since the rally was of peaceful character, the investigators hold that there was neither ground nor necessity to take a decision to end the rally by calling in Soviet Army units.

The decision, taken by the republic's leadership and officials of the USSR Armed Forces, was recognised as an unlawful act. Those guilty of it, in the judgement of the investigators, should be called to account.

Commission Meeting Noted

PM2007084989 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 4 Jul 89 p 3

[GRUZINFORM report: "In Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Commission"]

[Text] A routine session of the commission for the investigation of the incidents which occurred in Tbilisi 9 April 1989 began with a discussion of the rules for its subsequent work. The point is that as of today, as

planned, it has already drawn the appropriate conclusions on the majority of aspects of what happened, and this has been submitted in generalized form to the analogous commission created by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies working in the Georgian capital. Meanwhile the detailed elucidation of all circumstances of the events which occurred and the study of their cause and effect connections is continuing. After all, a document should be prepared containing an all-embracing political and legal assessment of what happened and must be submitted for examination by the republic's Supreme Soviet.

The commission heard reports from Zviad Gamsakhurdia, senior scientific employee at the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Academy of Sciences Institute of Georgian Literature named for Shota Rustaveli and from Nikoloz Lelashvili, graduate student at the Tbilisi militia school training center. One of the organizers and direct participants in the unauthorized meeting outside the government center and a guardian of order serving there—they were both eyewitnesses to the tragic events of that April night. Giving explanations and answering specific questions from members of the commission, each expressed his position and his thoughts and analyzed and assessed what happened from his own viewpoint. In particular it was said that the meeting was of a peaceful nature, that its slogans did not call for violence, that they were not anti-Russian, anti-Soviet, or anticonstitutional. And therefore the methods and means used during the operation to end the meeting can only be described as utterly unacceptable. It was stated that forces were operating here which were trying to stab perestroyka and the cause of renewal in the back.

Shota Nadirashvili, director of the Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Psychology and corresponding member of the republic's academy of sciences, familiarized the commission members with the conclusion drawn by the subcommission for the study of public opinion and the sociopolitical and psychological analysis of the incident, which he heads. On the basis of figures received as a result of a poll of nearly 10,000 people representing the most diverse strata of the population, the conclusion considers in depth and generalizes the cause and effect links of individual facts and phenomena and the sociopsychological situation which had taken shape in the republic as a whole before and after the tragedy.

The conclusion of the information subcommission led by People's Artist of the USSR Revaz Chkheidze, director of the "Gruziya-film" movie studio, was also thorough. It contains an analysis of the work of the mass media of the republic and country in the period before and after the tragedy. The conclusion which the subcommission reached was unanimous—the tragedy was not only a check of the professionalism and objectivity of the journalists and editorial offices but also a catalyst of morality.

Tajikistan-Kirghizia Border Clashes Noted

18300728 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 18 Jul 89 p 4

[Article by Staff Correspondent V. Yurlov from Bakten and Isfara: "The Situation Is Returning to Normal"]

[Text] **The sharp clashes between people of the Isfarinskiy Rayon of Tajikistan and the Batkenskiy Rayon of Kirghizia have already been reported in the press. More than a few people suffered; one person died. Leaders of both republics have taken urgent measures to regulate mutual claims and bring order.**

The conflict that took place at the border of the two brotherly republics, Kirghizia and Tajikistan, has a background. Its origins date back to the twenties, when the national-territorial delimitation of the republics took place. But historical discourse will hardly be conducive to success, because there exist three versions of maps, compiled in various years, and they are all quite official. They are not to be relied upon. Their analysis leads to greater confusion of the complex issue of the affiliation of the disputed lands.

The open-field system in these localities is extraordinary. One must cross the border several times on the way from Batken to Isfara. The government commissions, created in both republics, for studying and clarifying the borders of disputed land areas are faced with the task of making the necessary suggestions for the final resolution of the problem. This is an extraordinarily complicated task, and no one should expect an answer soon.

Both sides comprehend the importance of this mission and are determined to do everything to defuse the situation. The word "compromise" is widely used.

It is 20 kilometers between Batken and Isfara. Here they read the newspapers of both republics. They read with a bias. As soon as a phrase about the assimilation by Kirghiz residents of "an expansive parcel of disputed territory" slipped into published TASS material, a burst of indignation took place in Bakten. The residents of Isfarinskiy Rayon reacted no less sharply to a notice in the Kirghiz republic newspapers that said that "In May, the residents of the Tajik village of Oktyabr for no reason covered the canal which brings water to several villages of the Batkenskiy Rayon." They view it differently here. Apparently, we journalists should refrain from categorical appraisals, if we do not wish to add fuel to the fire of bitter conflict. Appraisals are a matter for the appropriate organs and committees.

The situation on the border is now returning to normal. Troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs have the situation completely under control. A curfew was imposed in the territory of the kishlak [village] soviets of Surkh, Chorku, and Vorukh of the Isfarinskiy Rayon.

Water flowed through the Matchoi canal for the Kirghiz farmers—700 liters per second. This is not much, of course. But it already is a result.

Meetings took place in the Batken Rayon committee of the Communist Party of Kirghizia and in the Isfara city committee of the Communist Party of Tajikistan, in which the leaders of both republics and the USSR people's deputies participated. A decision was made on cleaning the Matchoi canal. As the Batkenskiy Rayon party committee informed me, this decision has already been implemented.

Miners Strikes Attributed to Job Conditions

18220169 Moscow TRUD in Russian
21 Jul 89 p 1

[Statements by member of the USSR Supreme Soviet A. Saunin, docent of the Chair of Political Economy and Philosophy at the Makeyevka Institute of Engineering and Construction, and USSR People's Deputy V. Zubanov, secretary of the party committee of the Khartsyzsk Steel Wire and Rope Plant, to TRUD correspondent V. Karpov: "For the Right to Independence"]

[Text] [Saunin] The strikes have been spawned by the acute nature of the problems that industry is facing. Job conditions have been deteriorating continuously; mechanization and automation have been lagging. Everything has become a vital problem—day-care centers, the supply of services and amenities, housing... The miners found themselves in the situation of residents of villages without a promise. In turn, the level of remuneration for labor is extremely low. For example, the average salary in the "Makeyevugol" Association last year came to 240 rubles, which is not much higher than throughout the country. This is clearly unjust given the nature of miners' work, who have to go down the shafts to the depth of 1 kilometer, where gas and dust await them... Technically, the work day is one of the shortest—6 hours. However, during these 6 hours they haul coal. Actually, miners in the industry work 10 to 11 hours daily. After all, they also have to change, go down through meandering, tight mine workings, and then go back the same way... However, this time is not considered to be work time.

The strike in the Kuzbass or the Donbass cannot be reduced only to the local level. The Kuzbass is in difficulty, so we will help it. Now it is Donetsk... However, this is at someone's expense, to the detriment of someone's interests. Patching up the holes will start again...

[Zubanov] I agree that these are not local and not even industry-wide problems. These are the problems of our entire economy, entire society. However, in the case of miners they are sort of expressed in a more concentrated manner. As I see it, the demands of miners are entirely fair. There is not a whiff of extremism in them or the desire "to play up" the difficulties of the country.

[Saunin] Many issues are so simple that one wonders why they have not been resolved sooner by the managers of associations and the ispolkoms [executive committees] of local soviets. Apparently, the problem is in the ossification of our power structures and bureaucratism. Instead of business, there are pro forma responses, and instead of the desire to grasp the problems there are delays.

Demands of the striking miners in, say, Donetsk Oblast make bitter reading. For example, they raise the issues of electricity and water supply, switching to gas in mining settlements, increasing soap rations, and acknowledging occupational diseases as production-related traumas. How could the people who mine coal, rightfully called "the bread of industry," be slighted for years?

[Zubanov] Personally, I also believe that, the entire contradictory and complex situation notwithstanding, the strikes in this instance still are a factor of perestroyka to a great degree, which makes it possible to accelerate the advance of a radical economic reform. It is important that the workers feel that they are a real force.

[Saunin] Not just feel, but also want to take advantage of their opportunities and help perestroyka. Thought-through demands are voiced, and order is maintained everywhere.

[Zubanov] I am not a miner, but the demands of miners are very close and understandable for us, iron and steel industry employees. The labor collectives need to receive real rights to manage the funds generated and the results of their labor, so that economic accountability would be genuine rather than pro forma.

[Saunin] And so that enterprises could decide themselves whether they should stay in the ministry or not, determine the numbers of management personnel and staff. We have just had a conversation with M.S. Gorbachev about this that lasted almost 1 and ½ hours. We have found a common language quickly, and have become convinced that the leadership of the country wants and is capable of solving the problems we are now facing.

[Zubanov] Now that the goals of the miners have been determined, and the commissions have been created, the strikes have definitely got to be finished, and work has got to begin.

[Saunin] I second this entirely and completely. Too much is tied to the coal industry, too much depends on it.

Estonian Supreme Soviet Adopts New Electoral Law

LD0808175489 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian
1700 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Summary] The 12th session of the 11th convocation of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet resumed its work today. Ain Saarna reports. He says that

the election laws has been adopted and amendments to the Constitution have been made. Anybody who is age 18 or over and who has lived within the present constituency for 5 years or 5 years elsewhere in Estonia, is eligible to vote. Anybody who is age 18 or over and who has lived within the present constituency for (?5) years or for 10 years elsewhere in Estonia, is eligible to run as a candidate deputy. Of the 244 deputies present, 41 voted against. 198 deputies voted for the corresponding constitutional amendments.

Further on New Law

LD0808203289 Moscow TASS in English 1947 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Tallinn August 8 TASS—The session of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic, which opened on July 24, ended today with passing a law on elections to the local soviets of people's deputies and the amendments to the republic's constitution, stemming from it.

The session was interrupted in view of the differences in deputies' views on the key issue of a minimum residence requirement for voters and candidates to deputies.

Several amendments were made in the draft law following the analysis of the proposals made on the first day of the session. Nevertheless, consensus was not reached on the second day of the session either. Several articles of the draft law were put to a vote in different editions.

The session overwhelmingly voted in favour of the law of the Estonian SSR "on elections to local soviets of people's deputies of the Estonian SSR", which envisages franchise for the citizens of the republic who have reached the age of 18 and who have lived at least the last two years on the territory of the elected soviet (council) or five years in the Estonian SSR.

The law also stipulates that only those who have lived at least the last five years on the territory of the elected soviet or ten years elsewhere in Estonia may stand for local office.

The Supreme Soviet of the Estonian SSR set the elections to the local soviets for December 10.

Vajno Vaelaes, Estonian Communist Party leader, addressed the session.

Estonian Deputies Protest Tiyt Made Article

LD0808183889 Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Tallinn Auguest 8 ETA-TASS—Deputies from Estonia's Supreme Soviet described an article by Professor Tiyt Made from Tallinn as unconcealed provocation aimed at instigating national strife and undermining perestroika, at today's session of the republic's Parliament. The article, headlined "Great Russian Nationalism", was published by the Swedish newspaper SVENSKA DAGBLADET on July 24 and reprinted by the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on August 5.

Toomas Kork, a deputy of the Estonian Supreme Soviet, called Made a Stalinist provocateur.

"I learned about the article from a telephone conversation with an Estonian, who lives in Sweden after emigrating from the Soviet Union in 1944, and who has no reasons to love Soviet power or Russians," he said. "But even he called Tiyt Made's views as racist and said he was ashamed to be his compatriot. When I read the article myself I couldn't regard it other than an insult to the Russian people, a product of twisted mind."

"I would like to hope that the Russian people will forgive Estonians for the fact that there was a man among them who, without knowning the Russian people, assumed the right to paint a collective portrait and, what is more, in such colours."

The deputies from Estonia passed a statement which says, in part:

"The Swedish newspaper SVENSKA DAGBLADET published on July 24 an article by Tiyt Made, a people's deputy of the USSR, which contained extremely insulting pronouncements against the Russian people.

Racism was always alien to our society. We flatly condemn both the publication by the people's deputy of such an article in a foreign edition and the prompt distribution of its translation by our press. Such an act is aimed at instigating inter-ethnic strife, to which all of us should be opposed.

One can hope that Tiyt Made's electors will express their point of view on what has happened and inform the public of it.

The USSR people's deputies elected from Estonia appeal to all mass media which distributed the above article to publish this statement."

Tiyt Made Criticizes Gorbachev Leadership

PM2007100689 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 14 Jul 89 p 2

[Article by People's Deputy Tiyt Made: "Gorbachev at Close Quarters"]

[Text] From the television screen we get the impression that Mikhail Gorbachev is a democratically inspired father of the nation. He has the ability to make long speeches and succeed in persuading his audience, even though his recent speeches have increasingly lacked a clear goal. On foreign trips he smiles pleasantly, and this has meant that he is viewed very positively. People

abroad are convinced that he really wants a democratic country with calm progress in all of the Soviet Union's republics and that he wants nothing more than disarmament and international cooperation. That is how things can seem to the outsider who is not acquainted with the issues.

Seen at close quarters we have to deal with a much more complicated person, whose main goal is to preserve the empire and give the Russian republic a leading position in the Soviet Union's foreign policy and economy.

At the sessions of the Congress of People's Deputies and of the Soviet parliament, a completely different personality emerged. We really are dealing with an intelligent, clever, and multifaceted leader. With hindsight we can only be amazed that members of the Communist Party from such different backgrounds and with such different political views dared to choose so sharp a person as their leader. Perhaps there was no other alternative!

I was surprised by the way that he succeeded in getting his way in all situations—even the most hopeless. Gorbachev is a good tactician. He let the congress work all day, waste energy in long discussions; he took breaks, and was constantly changing his tactics. When the day was almost at an end and everyone was fighting against the longing to finish, Gorbachev forced a vote on some very important questions. Every time he succeeded in getting the result he himself had planned. I personally think that the disorder that often seemed to dominate the congress had even been planned. That was how the party leadership succeeded in eliciting from the 2,249 deputies decisions that under normal circumstances would have been impossible.

In a way meeting Mikhail Gorbachev was an experience for the Estonian delegation. We were well aware of Gorbachev's tactic of "talking his audience into submission." This would mean that he would arrive with a friendly smile and gently begin to tell us how perestroyka and glasnost have developed. Yes, of couse, there are problems in Estonia, but naturally we will overcome them together. He would talk and talk, and in this way would elicit positive reactions and thus succeed in giving the appearance of having had a very frank conversation with those with whom he was meeting.

The Estonian delegation had planned their tactics so that the three women members of the delegation would put a number of detailed questions to him to prevent his monologue. But, unfortunately, he saw through the ploy and succeeded in speaking for 80 percent of our meeting.

He handled the meeting with the Estonian delegation in just this pleasant way so that the majority of the members of the delegation left the meeting with sparkling eyes, with the impression that we had succeeded in explaining our problems to Gorbachev. That man would not leave the Estonians in the lurch! The papers published articles with cheery headlines: "Estonian Delegation's Great Day." Mikhail Gorbachev naturally promised the Estonians economic autonomy. He also expressed understanding of the tensions that have arisen between Estonians and Russians, that here we must "achieve clarity" (Gorbachev's favorite expression). But the next day we saw before us a man of very different words and actions.

When he appeared before the deputies of the congress, where he had majority support from the delegates from Central Asia, he no longer spoke of any economic self-government. Economic self-government must be combated, and that is what he has done. All activities engaged in the name of economic self-government are a cover and have the aim of preserving the Russians' supremacy. Thus all action has the aim of holding onto power. To preserve the impression of being a good father of the nation some decisions have to be made in secret and be carried out as if the leader knew nothing.

I myself am convinced that all the measures adopted to solve ethnic problems (Georgia, Nagorno-Karabakh) had Gorbachev's approval, even if he himself was abroad at the time. Historian Roy Medvedev has expressed surprise at the fact that so many extreme events could occur just when the top leader himself was abroad.

Does this not mean, then, that it is the conservative representatives who planned the retaliations? I think that Medvedev is wrong, however. These are actually well planned operations that have been carried out with Gorbachev's consent, but seemingly behind his back. Naturally, not all operations succeed, and then some comrade must be sacrificed (Ligachev and Yeltsin, for example).

Gorbachev's behavior during the congress was very calm and well balanced. In front of television viewers he listened, blushing somewhat, to the discussions which touched on his own person. But he took the whole thing very calmly. He only lost his composure briefly on two occasions.

The first time I noticed this he was answering questions and speculations about his ethnic background. Is he a Russian, after all? Those who think that they know (there are many soothsayers) state that Gorbachev is of Ukrainian origin because of his way of speaking and his pronunciation of certain words. Raisa is said by reliable sources to be of Tartar origin. This is said to be the reason why so many Tartars have been brought into posts in the central administration. Gorbachev said with great force that people should stop all genealogical research about him.

On the second occasion the situation was much more serious. It was during the final hours of the congress, when Andrey Sakharov was once again given the floor, and Gorbachev lost control of the auditorium for a short

time. I have stenographic records of the congress and these make it abundantly clear what a shambles it was. Here is a short quotation from the minutes covering Gorbachev's efforts to restore order: "Delegate Andrey Sakharov demands to be allowed to speak. We have discussed the question in the Presidium... Delegate Sakharov has already spoken seven times, and this we have accepted because of majority decisions... Comrades, let us clarify the question. Shall we allow him to speak? I would like to propose that Andrey Dmitriyevich should make his contribution to the debate in no more than 5 minutes. (Mutterings in the hall, because there is opposition to allowing Sakharov to speak.) One moment, comrades. Do we not need... I propose a compromise solution: Those who vote that Sakharov be given 5 minutes raise their delegate cards... (A large section of the auditorium raise their hands and Sakharov is allowed to speak. Sakharov proposes that the congress be declared a failure, and this leads to disorder among the congress delegates.)"

Only after a ittle while "is Gorbachev back in the saddle" and "leading the troops." He regains control, dismisses Sakharov's criticism, and declares the congress a success, to tumultuous applause. After all, the majority in the hall want a positive outcome, because it is they who have taken part and that is why failures are unacceptable. Gorbachev knows the emotions of his people and can shape them as he pleases, twist them round his little finger, and tame them if need be.

I cannot in any way say that Gorbachev is the Balts' friend. There is nothing to indicate that he is, even if some people have been inclined to live in that illusion. We still have to deal with a man who puts minority peoples on the same footing as small change and who is convinced that all must serve the great Russian people. Perhaps I am wrong, but this idea is deeply rooted in me. And only time will be able to tell who is right and who is wrong.

Estonian Communist Party Official Interviewed

LD2507213189 Tallinn RAHVA HAAL in Estonian 1 Jul 89 pp 1-2

[Interview with Mikk Titma, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, by Peeter Raidla: "On elections, Democracy, and Local Power"; Quotation marks as published]

[Excerpts] **The draft election law has been presented to the people for discussion. A very complex political struggle lies ahead. What are we like, entering this struggle? How should one act and what is worthwhile to be considered? We endeavor to find an answer to these and some other questions in an interview with Mikk Titma, secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee.** [passage omitted]

[Raidla] Is the party ready to share power? Is the Communist Party of Estonia going to elections with a platform of its own?

[Titma] [Passage omitted] "In this sense also the present stance of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee is clear: We do not intend to go out in the name of the party with any party list. We will clearly endeavor to ensure that the most capable people are elected, who will manage to run things locally and who enjoy the trust of the people.

The aim of party politics is indeed this: to push through a certain number of candidates, via a strong leader and a program of their own, in order to hold onto power through their votes. For example, had the elections for the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet taken place this spring, the votes would have mainly been split between the Inter-Movement and the United Council [of Work Collectives] on the one hand and the People's Front on the other. At the moment the situation has changed.

For this reason indeed we think that during the elections emphasis should be placed on individuals; that a certain compromise should be achieved, with the teams with the best thrust being put together at all levels."

[Raidla] At the same time it is clearly visible that some movements have become political; for example, the Greens and the Rural Union [both recently approved by the Supreme Soviet Presidium as political entities] I think that the People's Front, too, may adopt clearly definable party outlines by autumn.

[Titma] "That is normal. But this is also conditioned by the fact that many see in this an opportunity to get power. A person who was never noticed before, has suddenly become one of the leaders of public life.

But I emphasize once again: It is necessary to elect the strongest and the most capable, in order to lead our society away from the crisis.

And yet, we are opposed to certain platforms becoming anti-communist, so to speak. This is a completely destructive attitude which would politicize the situation and would create opposition, without a way out which would enable the problem to be solved."

[Raidla] Could there not occur a direct public split in the Communist Party of Estonia during the elections?

[Titma] "Certainly there could. In essence the Communist Party of Estonia is indeed at the moment represented by most trends and ideas within the society. In such a way the Communist Party of Estonia could not even exist in its more distant future. Having been

monopolist in the past, the party encompassed indeed almost the whole active section of society. Now many of those people who previously had been looking on, have also become active.

Let us imagine for a moment that in the present situation an internal party cleansing would be introduced. This woud obviously be an extremely wrong step. We have to allow discussion at the moment, the existence of different views, and at certain moments we will have to endeavor to work out the party's future policy, with which one could proceed as a party. That is the only possible step."

[Raidla] But what about the outline for the party's action program offered by the four men [not further identified]? The 14th Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee Plenum also in fact adopted a resolution setting up a relevant commission.

[Titma] [passage omitted] "Even if we already have the theses for the Communist Party of Estonia action program ready, it is not possible at the moment to release them for public discussion because the election law needs to be discussed and local Soviets need to be restored; we will also have to discuss our platform on ethnic relations." [passage omitted]

[Raidla] Perhaps we could now talk specifically about the draft election law. It declares the Estonian SSR citizen its subject, even though we have no citizenship law. Would there not arise a conflict here?

[Titma] "A conflict of course exists. But as we have not succeeded in achieving a sensible political compromise in respect of citizenship, then ignoring this detail we would simply split the society at a very responsibility-filled moment. It is necessary to set in motion positive processes in the society. At the moment it indeed appears from the draft law that an Estonian SSR citizen is a person who has registered here permanently."

[Raidla] At the same time only those who have lived in the same place for 5 years or in Estonia for 15 years are eligible for election.

[Titma] "Conflicts are likely to arise from this, too. But I would like to say that we consciously aimed at setting up local governments before the elections to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet. It is necessary to instil in the public the principle of settlement. Until now we have enjoyed the illusion that equality and freedom mean that everybody has everything the same way. In essence this means bourgeois levelling.

A person who has lived in Estonia for only 1 or 2 years cannot take upon himself the right to start teaching everybody how life should be led here. Only someone who is familiar with the situation, who behaves responsibly and to whom local life is not all the same, can be elected locally.

Once this principle has been adopted, from there we can already proceed to the elections of the republican Supreme Soviet. We must make everyone understand that a republic is a very complicated system. It would be completely wrong to elect people who do not know Estonia to govern us. A republic is not a geographical term. It is an association of people living here. And one must know these people."

[Raidla] Delving into the draft election law, I perceived that the forthcoming elections will indeed be really free elections. In principle, everybody, including ERSP [Estonian National Independence Party], for example, will have a right to set up their own candidates if the provision concerning citizens' initiative is sensibly applied.

[Titma] "We do not at all exclude ERSP's participation in the elections. The only condition is that the candidate must openly recognize the existing regime. If that is not done, then one cannot be a candidate for the parliament of that society either. That is the only condition. This is the way it is in the whole civilized world."

[Raidla] In several places, citizens' committees included, much talk has taken place about secession from the Union. even the so-called pure versions have been presented.

[Titma] "At the moment a question of this kind has indeed been raised. On their own, Communists or anybody else in the world cannot say that Estonia could not again be an independent state. If Iceland can be one, why not Estonia? To claim the contrary would be absurd.

But the problem could indeed be posed in a different way: Does the actual political situation (both in the world and in Europe) allow for this? What about the situation in our own country? Hence, another question: What are the pros and cons for secession? What does it give and what does it remove? All this must first be weighed. [passage omitted]

We do see, however, that at present a transformation is talking place in our country toward a mechanism of political decisionmaking of this kind, where the peoples' right to self-determination can be implemented through the real political process. The transfer of power into the hands of the Supreme Soviet, the formation of a new constitution, and the incorporation of this right in it, will indeed create a mechanism so that, should the Estonian people at a certain moment so decide, then the question of secession could be raised by them. But then it will already be placing the question within real politics and it will be done with full responsibility. And then it will also find corresponding acceptance by the Union's top bodies. [passage omitted]

One must also say that one can use very apposite expressions about the disintegration of the USSR, but in fact things are far from it, because there is sufficient

force to prevent this from happening. Essential political changes will begin to take place once economic thinking becomes dominant in the Union; once resources are taken into account, a humane environment is created, and a change indeed begins toward becoming a civilized country. Then sober discussions will also emerge within the leadership of the Union, like at one time in France, in De Gaulle's government: Is there any point in keeping big France together?

Until now, on certain occasions the Army has been used, and one fears that that will also be done in the future. But all this costs something. With time, the question will emerge: What is the benefit from it?

So that a normal political development will lead us up to the point where we will begin to live democratically." [passage omitted]

Lithuanian Youths Attack Militia 25 Jun

18001402 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 29 Jun 89 p 4

[Statement by Chief of the Administration for the Maintenance of Public Order of the Lithuanian SSR MVD A. Vilkas: "Incident on Mount Rambinas"]

[Text] Readers have been calling the editorial office of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA LITVA with requests to describe what happened last Sunday [25 June] on Mount Rambinas in Shilutskiy Rayon. They know from rumors that militia employees who were maintaining public order were attacked by a group.

At the request of the editorial office, Chief of the Administration for the Maintenance of Public Order of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] A. Vilkas explains:

"On 24 June, the Ionas Holiday was held in Shilutskiy Rayon, on Mount Rambinas, as well as in other locations of the republic. During the holiday, public order in the rayon was maintained by employees of the Shilutskiy ROVD [Rayon Department of Internal Affairs]. They were additionally reinforced by 20 persons. Militia employees equipped a special compound for their headquarters and cordoned it off with ropes.

"Around 2200 hours, an organized group of 50 to 60 persons consisting mainly of intoxicated youths, having armed themselves with wooden sticks and other objects, rushed into the compound of militia headquarters. The youths behaved rudely and aggressively. They attempted to attack a squad car parked there, in which arms and riot control gear were stored. They demanded that an intoxicated young man be freed who behaved disorderly and was detained earlier. However, this was not the only demand to motivate the youths. They shouted threats against the Russian-speaking populace, and at the same time demanded that militia employees not come to its defense.

"However, the militia employees behaved in a dignified and principled manner. The chief of the Shilutskiy ROVD was compelled to order the use of rubber sticks in order to subdue the enraged group of drunken youths. Order was restored.

"The Shilutskiy ROVD is conducting an investigation and determining the ringleaders in the attack who will be charged.

"In summation, I would like to stress how necessary it is, after all, to arm the militia employees with at least rubber sticks given the situation which has emerged in the republic—and not only for their own protection. Incidentally, cases of militia employees being attacked in various localities are not rare. The main point is that protection of citizens against any encroachment should be ensured."

U.S. Consul Visits Vilnius Newspaper

LD2007131289 Vilnius KOMJAUNIMO TIESA in Lithuanian 13 May 89 p 1

[Interview with James Hutcheson, U.S. consul for press and cultural affairs in Leningrad, by Brone Vainauskiene, in Vilnius, date not given, entitled "Diplomatic Curtsy For The Press"]

[Text] U.S. Consul for Press and Cultural Affairs in Leningrad, James Hutcheson, recently visited Lithuania. He dropped by the KOMJAUNIMO TIESA editorial office. This was not an official visit, but rather, a unique get-acquaint d excursion. We are no longer surprised by the interest shown by Western politicians and diplomats, toward social life aspects of the Baltic Republics; nevertheless, it was truly unexpected to have the guest select the editorial office of a youth newspaper, for a discussion of the current problems of our press, culture and politics. Barely a year ago, intelocutors from Western countries, used to scatter in all directions, upon learning, we represented a komsomol publication. Mr Hutcheson, apparently regarded this as a journalistic prank, but it is pleasing, nevertheless, to see an increase in contacts and trust between us.

Our guest's first question dealt with our circulation, although it is quite possible, he had a previous knowledge of this. As every polite individual does, he began our conversation by discussing subjects pleasing to his hosts. We are fully aware of the fact we don't always operate in an ideal manner, however circulation, also indicates the public's desire to know. Thus, it is undoubtedly, useful for any individual connected with the press, to decide, how and with what, we can capture our reader's interest, how journalists, in another part of the world regard their own profession, the reader, social existence, government politics etc. Having heard our reasoning on possibilities of the Republic's press, concerning what we write about, and what we hear from our readers, the guest expressed his regret over the fact he can not subscribe to KOMJAUNIMO TIESA, since the

U.S. Leningrad Consulate receives only a limited list of newspapers published in the country. SOVETSKAYA LITVA represents Lithuanian press on that list.

In talking with Mr Hutcheson, we learned he is sincerely amazed at how very belatedly the central, as well as the Leningrad press, presents cultural information; for instance, reviews of a theater premiere appear 2-3 weeks later. That was a pretext to discuss technical capabilities of our press. Of course, the fact a review appears in the newspaper, half a month later, can not be blamed on outdated newspaper technology. This fact is more of an indication of an editor's regard toward culture. Even if we had a strong desire to print last night's play review, in the morning paper, we could not do so, because our printing cycle is too long.

My colleagues joked that the most professional journalists of TIME, or THE GUARDIAN, would not be able to put out a paper in our facility.

Our guest added, that perhaps the staff members of these papers have forgotten, indeed, how one used to work 50-60 years ago. I think it would be no easier for us, in the TIME editorial office, in spite of the fact it uses computers, by means of which text travels from the editorial office directly to the printing office. They don't publish a four-page paper, but one which weighs several hundred grams. We were interested to know whether a four-page newspaper would have a following in a large American city. Mr Hutcheson was doubtful.

He admitted that his greatest joy, upon return to America, is to buy a pile of thick newspapers, and to read them from morning till night, while sipping coffee. His favorite papers include: WASHINGTON POST, THE GUARDIAN and CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR.

Like all current conversations, ours also, turned to politics. This time, questions were being asked about us. Our guest warned us at the onset, he would give his own personal opinion, not an official one, since economic politics are not within his field.

In spite of this, however, he did answer our question on how the changes in the Baltic area are regarded.

—The US Embassy is following developments in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, with great interest, however, I must admit, I can not give a prognosis on further developments.

For over 40 years, the economy of all three republics was part of the Union's economy. How can they be separated? It would be easier to resolve this if a precedent existed somewhere in the world. It is totally unclear to me, how this can be accomplished, in practice, if the Center were not to oppose this and would allow it to develop according to the Baltic Republics' wishes. I would like to ask whether you think, your drafts contain solutions to every problem.

Alas, there was no futurologist, among us, who could reply "yes" or "no." Our guest expressed some doubts concerning a great deal of optimism:—I consider it quite possible, the economic situation may only worsen, initially. I would pose this question to you: are the people quite prepared to endure a worsened situation? The great support of Sajudis ideas, demonstrates, that, for the time being, the people are prepared to suffer, but for how long?

We asked how things appeared to Mr Hutcheson, himself, since he has had the opportunity to associate with our people. Do we differ from the residents of Leningrad, or do we all appear similar—soviet people, and that's all?

—I have never believed that somewhere there could exist the widely renown "homo sovieticus." I have heard from politicians, who are more familiar with the Soviet Union than I am, that Baltic people are more open, than those in other republics.

Mr Hutcheson has taught in (?Kotowice) and later, held the cultural attache post, at the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw, and this prompted us to ask how our present situation resembles and differs from the last decade's situation in Poland. This is how he replied:

—I heard some say, Lithuania is following in Hungary's footsteps. Perhaps, it is so. To me, the situation, in Lithuania, seems to be following more, the Polish variant. I think, however, the general economic situation in Poland, is even worse. In essence, it has to be restructured. That does not imply, it must be modeled after us, or anyone else. It is most difficult to choose an individual path, after evaluating the existing situation and social possibilities.

Naturally, we were most anxious to learn, from our guest, whether in his view, we had progressed further than any of the neighbors around us, however, Mr Hutcheson, replied, he did not know us or our neighbors sufficiently. At this point, our guest was listening more than answering, while eyeing the dictaphone with some concern.

We must understand, a diplomat is not always permitted to do all a journalist can do. Besides, this was a private conversation....

Latvian Draft Law on Demonstrations Issued

PM1407134189 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 24 Jun 89 p 2

["Draft Law of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic on Meetings, Rallies, Street Marches, and Demonstrations"—SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA headline]

[Text] 1. The Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Constitution, in conformity with the interests of the people and for the purpose of strengthening and developing the socialist system, guarantees citizens' freedom

to hold meetings, rallies, street marches, and demonstrations and their freedom of speech. These political freedoms shall be ensured by making public buildings, streets, squares, and other public places available to working people and their organizations.

2. During the organization and holding of meetings, rallies, street marches, and demonstrations and during the public expression of individual citizens' views, it is necessary to observe the laws, public order, and citizens' rights and legitimate interests.

It is impermissible to organize events aimed at fanning racial or national dissension, at propagandizing violence and war, or at other actions prohibited by law.

Soviet of people's deputies executive committees [ispolkoms] ensure public order at venues where events are held.

3. In order to hold meetings, rallies, street marches, and demonstrations, the agents empowered by enterprise, institution, and organization labor collectives, cooperative and other public organizations, unsponsored social organs, and groups of individual citizens must file an application with the ispolkom within whose jurisdiction the venue of the event lies.

Applications to organize meetings, rallies, street marches, and demonstrations are not to be accepted from citizens under the age of 18.

An ispolkom can set the venue and time for holding a meeting or rally without an application being filed.

4. No application need be filed by individual citizens wishing to express their views in public by means of posters, slogans, banners, or other visual aids. They are not permitted to use entrances and stairways at enterprises, institutions, or organizations, to obstruct the passage of pedestrians in the streets, or to hinder the free flow of traffic.

5. Applications for organizing meetings, rallies, street marches, or demonstrations are to be filed with the ispolkom by the agents (organizers) of the event in question not later than 7 days prior to the event. Subject to the ispolkom's consent, the time for filing an application may be reduced.

The application shall indicate:

The event (meeting, rally, street march, or demonstration), its purpose, the venue and march route, the approximate number of participants, the date, and the time when the event is scheduled to begin and end;

The agents (organizers) and the persons responsible for order in organizing and holding the event.

6. The application shall be signed by the agents (organizers) and by the persons responsible for order in organizing and holding the event, indicating each one's surname, given name, patronymic, date of birth, place of residence, and place of work or study.

7. If, due to objective circumstances, it proves impossible to organize and hold the event in the place and at the time specified in the application, the ispolkom shall, within 3 days of an application being filed, examine this question at a session to which the agents (organizers) shall be invited and shall make a reasoned decision changing the venue, time, and other conditions for the holding of the event.

In such an event, the agents (organizers) shall be notified in writing of the ispolkom's decision immediately following its adoption.

8. An appeal against an ispolkom's decision changing the venue, time, and other conditions for the holding of meetings, rallies, street marches, and demonstrations can be filed by agents (organizers) with a higher-ranking executive or administrative organ which shall make a final decision within 3 days.

9. The organizers shall hold the meeting, rally, street march, or demonstration in the agreed place and at the agreed time in conformity with the goals indicated in the application and shall ensure that participants in the event observe public order.

10. State institutions, public organizations, officials, and citizens shall have no right to create obstacles to the holding of meetings, rallies, street marches, or demonstrations or to the actions of individual citizens publicly expressing their opinions, provided that the procedure laid down by this law has been observed, and they shall have no right to prevent the announcement of such events in mass media.

11. In the event of noncompliance with the present law's demands, any meeting, rally, street march, or demonstration or any action by individual citizens publicly expressing their opinion by means of posters, slogans, banners, and other visual aids shall be terminated at the demand of representatives of the relevant ispolkom.

12. Persons in breach of the procedure for organizing and holding events specified in the present law shall be held liable under Latvian SSR legislation.

13. The procedure for organizing and holding meetings and rallies as laid down in the present law shall not apply to meetings and rallies of labor collectives and public organizations held in conformity with the law and the statutes and rules of these collectives and organizations inside buildings or premises belonging to them or on the territory of enterprises, institutions, and organizations.

Conference Held on Nizhnyaya Kartli Situation

PM2007093789 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 7 Jul 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] On 5 July a conference was held of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee in connection with the situation that has taken shape in some rayons of Nizhnyaya Kartli and was chaired by G. Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee.

Comrades G. Anchabadze, T. Lordkipanidze, B. Makharashvili, A. Pavshentsev, O. Cherkeziya, N. Chitanava, P. Chkheidze, O. Kvilitaya, chairman of the government commission, and leaders of the republic's law enforcement organs took part in the work of the conference.

The conference noted that thanks to the prompt measures of the party, soviet, and law enforcement organs of the republic, and also of the relevant rayons and subdivisions of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic Ministry of Internal Affairs, and thanks to the high degree of responsibility, restraint, and endeavor of the working people of Tbilisi and of Marneulskiy, Bolnisskiy, Dmanisskiy, and Gardabanskiy rayons, the situation has been stabilized, a normal working rhythm has been restored, and the population of Tbilisi and Rustavi is being supplied with vegetables according to plan. In recent days no serious violations of public order have been observed. Criminal proceedings have been instituted in 17 cases, the majority of participants in acts of hooliganism have been identified, hundreds of edged weapons and firearms have been confiscated, and the internal affairs organs employee are actively continuing preventive work to restore calm and order.

At the same time it was stated that it is essential to step up the effectiveness and coordination of the law enforcement organs' work in this direction and to accelerate the investigation, which was assigned to the republic's prosecutor, V. Razmadze, personally. It is necessary to ascertain promptly and completely all the details, causes, and prerequisites of the acts of provocation which took place in these rayons and to establish all the culprits, organizers and inciters of the outbursts of hooliganism and attempts to sow interethnic enmity who, whoever they may be, must answer to the law. The same thing is demanded by the republic's broad public, the thousands of authors of letters, telegrams, and collective statements that have reached the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, and the representatives of various nationalities.

It was also noted that the party, soviet, and law enforcement organs with the active participation and support of the republic's working people and broad public must do everything to further normalize the situation and to avoid all kinds of misunderstandings and complications and that every citizen must be made aware of the pointlessness and impermissibility of any attempt to aggravate interethnic relations and such an attempt's pernicious consequences, which was formulated so clearly in Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's speech on Central Television.

It has been recommended that the republic's mass media provide fuller and prompter information for the population on the situation in the Nizhnyaya Kartli region so as to ascertain the truth, show the objective situation, and prevent passions from being kindled because of gossip and scandal.

Formation of Georgian People's Front Viewed

PM2607104789 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 89 p 2

[Article by own special correspondents R. Guseynov and N. Mikeladze under the "We Are Learning Democracy" rubric: "People's Front: Polemical Reflections Regarding a Mass Movement"]

[Text] Tbilisi-Moscow—Tbilisi at the end of June. It was as if nothing had changed in the city. The heat was melting the asphalt on Rustaveli Prospect, the water of the Lagidze was as sweet and aromatic as ever, young Tbilisi boys enthusiastically played ball, and the city dwellers offered a welcoming smile to those arriving... But the frequent visitor here would have noticed marked changes. This city, which was usually abundantly decorated with slogans and appeals, had gotten rid of an appreciable amount of its vast agitation material and become more austere; the figure of S. Ordzhonikidze had been taken down from its plinth and secreted in a shapeless sheet-metal sarcophagus—the monument had constantly been spattered with paint by unknown persons and was then removed altogether; Stalin Embankment remained one of the city's main thoroughfares, but small population centers named for Bolsheviks—Makharadze, Tskhakaya, and Ordzhonikidze—bore different names on the map. The pompous monumental sculptures of the worker and the collective farm girl on Lenin Square had disappeared altogether.

For many inhabitants of Tbilisi this spot in the city center is linked to the tragedy that occurred on the night of 9 April. That date has become an open wound in Georgia's recent history. Respecting the decision of the Congress of People's Deputies, which set up a commission to investigate the events in Tbilisi, we will not discuss their causes. But one thing has to be said very clearly and firmly: Not a single event that occurs in this Transcaucasian republic today can be understood or explained if you forget what happened in front of Government House, in the center of Tbilisi, at 0400 on 9 April. "We have recently been living in an unreal world. But we will never get back to the way we were," Vakhtang Abashidze, editor of the newspaper MOLODEZH GRUZIYI, told us. Sitting on the table was the newspaper file containg that memorable April issue. Its

final column was edged in black. There was a photograph of a tank with its gun at the ready crawling along the street, and an appeal entitled "To the Citizens!" signed by the journalists of Georgia's youth paper.

"Everyone of us is to blame for what happened. Reason forces us to say that this need not have been...

"...What did we do to prevent the senseless deaths and injuries? What will we say to our children when we have to answer not for 9 March 1956 but 9 April 1989? Today's youth is called the generation that knows no fear. Was it really necessary that this fear enter into every cell and pore and again be transmitted to the following generation?"

People living in Georgia today, like everywhere else in the country, are thinking today about the future of perestroyka, the fate of our people, and, let us be completely frank, about the future of socialism.

Democratization and glasnost have burst open a whole mass of problems accumulated over many years. We are dealing with a crisis of the organs of power and the emergence of new structures that have markedly altered the role and potential of party committees in a number of regions in the country. We will not talk about the speakers from the "Democratic Union" and organizations of that ilk (they also exist in Georgia) who set out to shock the public. They can scarcely be seriously considered as an alternative to the existing power. But there is a real social force, one represented, moreover, in the Supreme Soviet—the people's fronts. They are already active in the Baltic republics, and the founding congresses of the Georgian and Belorussian People's Fronts were held recently.

The people's fronts persistently emphasize their sociopolitical nature and object when they are described as a party. Nevertheless, in a number of regions they are near the point where they will become a determinant force in society. You can call these movements a front, a union, or even a lifeguards' society. The essence remains the same. And those who do not understand this, who do not see or do not wish to see this, will have to confront this fact after the elections to local organs of power.

Attempts to set up a front and legalize it have been made earlier. For example, in that tense month of last November. And later, right up to the tragic events of April. Eldar Nikolayevich Shengelaya, chairman of the Georgian Cinematographers' Union, described how a decision was taken shortly before 9 April to open the doors of Cinema House and invite everyone who wanted to take part in setting up a people's front. Without any authorization for it... "There was no other way. The official leadership ignored all our attempts to officially register the People's Front, although it was already too late," E.N. Shengelaya concuded sadly.

Yes, it is easy to conjecture with hindsight, but let us say nevertheless that the People's Front, invested with the rights and at least the trust of the people that it enjoys today, might have been able to bring about a compromise between the "extreme-minded" informal leaders who headed the rally of many days' duration outside Government House and republic leaders. These, however, as is well known, did not once sit down at the negotiating table during that extremely tense situation. The repeatedly proposed meetings were repeatedly turned down. And force was used by those who had it available...

However, life goes on. The cities and villages go about their business. People work. And the old, forbidden mechanisms also operate within the whole fabric of our customary existence. They can in principle be removed by making concessions to the spontaneous demands of the masses, but spontaneity, however, does not produce a constructive concept of development. That is plain to all. And that is why people awaited so expectantly the setting up of the People's Front.

The Georgian People's Front is a Georgian national front, as some speakers said, and although the idea was not completely developed, no one made any different claim. In this regard it is distinct from the Baltic people's fronts, where the idea of a union bringing together all the nations of a republic has existed and been repeatedly stated. The fact that subsequently the statements were not actually backed up is another matter.

This makes it possible to draw the conclusion that the political philosophy of people's fronts gravitates toward the indigenous population of republics, and that means that a party created on the basis of a front will undoubtedly be a nationalist one. Not, of course, in the negative sense that we usually attach to "nationalism," but in the objective sense that indicates that the party serves the interests of one defined nation. We delight in citing in our publications the experience of other democracies, particularly West European ones. Such parties are an anachronism in multinational countries today and enjoy no real political power. That in any event is the situation in Britain, France, Italy, Spain, and the Scandinavian countries. Is that not because the actual idea of such political associations at bottom contains an element that runs counter to national interests. There are, of course, justified priorities and natural rights—at least to one's own homeland. And in observing them civilized society has chosen another route—it has closely interwoven not only nations but their economic, political, and cultural interests and needs. It is no accident that present-day West Europe is increasingly gravitating toward "European citizenship," toward merging into a single organism knitted together by common interests. And this association is, in our view, a realistic prospect for the near future and will bring only benefit to the peoples inhabitating our continent... But let us return to our own problems.

Georgia, whose population is approximately 5.1 million (this data is from 1979), is the most multiethnic republic in the Caucasus. Here there are 3,438,000 Georgians, 448,000 Armenians, 372,000 Russians, 256,000 Azerbaijanis, 95,000 Greeks, 83,000 Abkhazians, 65,000 Osetians, and 45,000 Ukrainians along with thousands of Jews, Kurds, and Assyrians. The non-Georgian population's interests were virtually unrepresented at the People's Front congress.

There were many invited people present. They were primarily from informal organizations. The greatest activity was exhibited by informal groups of the "extreme wing." It is no accident that Z. Gamsakhurdiya, the undisputed leader of that wing, roundly criticized the national front statutes and program submitted for discussion for lack of "national spirit" and clearly expressed priorities for the Georgian people on their own land.

Every effort was made to ensure that the People's Front should prove itself as "radical" as possible at the stage of its first—founding—congress. Initially it seemed that everything was heading that way. To be honest, the rallies in Tbilisi proceed far more calmly than did the congress in the Philharmonic Hall. Exercising the almost unlimited right to speak, some speakers at the microphone made, in our view, unjustifiably drastic speeches.

The attempted appeal by one delegate for political realism and work in the light of the existing Constitution, which must be retained rather than destroyed, provoked a stormy rebuke. One visitor, forgetting that there was a young woman at the rostrum, glared at her and said: "Who are you and why are you up there?" It cannot be said that such a debating method was supported in the hall. Some delegates, including Doctor of Philosophical Sciences N. Natadze, subsequently elected chairman of the People's Front Board, and R. Chkheidze, the well-known movie director, demonstrated during discussion of the painful Abkhazian question far more realism and restraint. The development of events in Abkhazia since the congress has shown that restraint from both sides is very necessary.

But let us give the floor to those who in no small way are determining the Georgian People's Front policy today. We had many such conversations. We will present extracts from three which, in our view, are sufficiently instructive.

Merab Mamardashvili, doctor of philosophical sciences:

"It can be said that a nondemocratic situation has been expressed at the People's Front congress in a democratic way. Unfortunately, while a glaring need does exist, there is to date a lack of democratic expertise.

"We have failed to notice that in our desire to set up the People's Front we have set up another centralized party. If you take as the absolute truth the statutes adopted, and indeed the very nature of the status of the presidency...

"Unfortunately, an improper basis for the whole People's Front movement has been created from the very outset; it has to be adopted in the knowledge that it is going to be subsequently modified and rectified in the course of events. In the course of the maturation of social consciousness, political expertise, and democratic mental structures. Clearly, democratic truths are the kind of truths that cannot be implanted from without."

Irakliy Melashvili, student at Tbilisi State University:

"I represent the Union of National Justice, which has a membership of 300. The thrust of our program is to restore Georgian independence outside the USSR. It is necessary to revert to the state when Georgia and the RSFSR were joined by a treaty which was subsequently breached. We will seek to set up a parliament on a multiparty basis. The national question is one of the most important for us. Our union has its own position here—that is to say, national-cultural autonomy. But in the official, cultural sphere there will be no language other than Georgian. It will be solely Georgian. Those who recognize the rights and language of the indigenous people will receive Georgian citizenship."

Nodar Natadze, doctor of philosophical sciences and chairman of the Georgian People's Front Board:

"Our front is a people's front, not a national front. A national front could have been formed, and the program would be somewhat different but virtually the same. The people's front is open to all of us, irrespective of nation or creed. If you are, for example, a negro from Zimbabwe and share the high ideals which we serve you can stand alongside us, in our ranks.

"Representatives of party bodies have been invited to the congress. Regarding our future cooperation with them I want to say that we enjoy relaxed, amicable relations with them today. But no one will be invited into our movement by virtue of his office, everyone will be invited as an individual.

"It was said during the congress debate that communist leaders cannot be elected on to the board. How do I regard this? When I had heard all the arguments, I did see a certain logic. If a person is a functionary and receives a wage for this, he cannot become a member of the board. A board member should put all his political energy into work for the People's Front. If, however, he is not a functionary in another organization, the problem of his participation in the board does not arise.

"The People's Front is a sociopolitical organization, but will not be a party. It is a movement. Someone who does not agree with some point or other can leave the movement for a time. We will not straitjacket our members, and the actual fact of someone's taking part in the People's Front will not oblige him to agree with everything it does or says.

"The People's Front will play an active part in the local soviet elections.

"Regarding the national question, there will be no problems because Georgia—I say this with complete confidence—is the most tolerant country and the Georgian people the most tolerant people in the world..."

Diverse people with diverse views, as you can see. But passions seethed not only in the large Philharmonic Hall. Let us leave the hall for a while to return there toward the end of the congress.

There has long existed in the very center of Tbilisi a spot which the local inhabitants call the Maydan. The destiny of several peoples and religions has been closely interwoven here, in the land of Georgia. The residence of Patriarch Iliya II of Georgia, the Sioni Orthodox Cathedral, a mosque, a synagogue, and an Armenian church stand peacefully virtually next door to one another. This, if you wish, is not just religious but also national pluralism. Nor should it be forgotten that the Georgians have always been noted for their tolerance toward other peoples, irrespective of their nationality or creed. The harried and persecuted have found shelter and a home in this land. We are convinced that all the peoples living in this land should treat Georgian culture, traditions, and language with respect. But the Georgian people and their culture will become enriched if they treat with respect in these difficult times, as in the past, the other peoples whose development has proceeded alongside them.

National consciousness has been aroused in many regions today. People are worried by problems concerning the economy, culture, and language. There exist leaders who encourage people to seek the cause of all ills in the machinations of a particular nation. One can of course proceed in this way, gathering whole crowds as you go. But history, after all, is properly understood only in its whole diversity, not by an isolated episode of quite difficult relations among our peoples.

Thus the history of Georgia in the post-October period is closely interwoven with Russia and the Bolshevik party. Whether some people like it or not, the influence of Georgian Bolsheviks and socialists on the destiny of the Russian revolutionary movement and on the formation and development of the Soviet state is considerable. It must also be remembered that this was a tragic time and the fate of many Georgian Bolsheviks was likewise tragic. However, there crept into the speeches of some people during the days we attended the People's Front congress a desire—sometimes direct, sometimes oblique—to put all Georgian Communists, without exception and without any discrimination of person, in the position of repentant sinners.

Some speeches voiced from time to time the following thought: Get a shot at the party and the soviets, and everything will be fine. Only how is this to be done? Where will we go then and how? We ask these questions with understandable journalistic interest. We still lack trenchant, just criticism. But we lack a constructive program still more.

A certain confusion reigns today in the ranks of Georgian Communists. We write about this without any desire to wound anyone, but... Ten places were granted to party and soviet organs to take part in the People's Front congress. We found not a single leader of the republic or Tbilisi City party organization at the congress during the first days of its work, and no one appeared on the rostrum and uttered even a few brief words on the party's behalf.

Why, then, did an instructor of the city party committee with whom we wanted to discuss the progress of the congress decline to do so, saying that he was attending "unofficially"! And why was it only toward the end of the congress, when virtually all its work was over, that a speech by a representative of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee was heard. After all, many people in the hall were ready to engage in debate and search for constructive solutions. And many people wanted to clarify for themselves the Central Committee's stance vis-a-vis the People's Front and the extent of its readiness to cooperate. But surely it is clear that during the most acute revolutionary periods victory will go to those forces which can show flexibility, determination, and also political courage, who reject traditional forms of work, who can convince the majority to follow them, who face up to acute problems rather than avoiding them, and who take risks rather than just sitting idly by, pretending that everything will solve itself?

There is a difficult atmosphere in the Georgia's Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol]. The criticism of the Georgian Komsomol made at the the congress must not be underestimated. One speaker, after saying that the Georgian Komsomol had completely discredited itself, demanded the creation of a new "youth patriotic organization." Among the first proposed steps were the active promotion of young nonparty cadres, a change in the title of the Komsomol newspaper MOLODOY KOMMUNIST, the removal of the slogan "Proletariats of all countries, unite!" from the masthead....

During the days of the congress' work we talked with dozens of young people. We are not going to adopt extreme positions. The majority of young people are at a crossroads now. The values on which they were raised in the past have now been well and truly tarnished and, in some cases, crushed by 9 April: Other values being

offered to them by certain People's Front activists alarm many people, although they are attractively packaged. How necessary it is to help young people get their bearings today!

I saw how attentively young people heed the voices of people well known in the republic: poets, writers, moviemakers, and scientists. Unfortunately, because they are often uncoordinated, these voices do not always convey "the reasonable, the good, and the eternal" to those who listen to them. Why is that? A conversation between A. Golovkov, a journalist, and Prof V. Kotetishvili of Tbilisi University, is indicative in that respect. The conversation was prompted by the 9 April events, but the conclusions are valid elsewhere, too.

"Why, in your view, did the Georgian intelligentsia fail to influence the course of events and not try to avert the tragedy?"

"The intelligentsia withdrew into its shell, but that wasn't its fault. We have experienced a very great deal. My father, for instance, suffered in the repressions of Stalin's time. The duty of that section of the Georgian intelligentsia was to protect its moral purity. To preserve its faith in something pure, bright, and real... Ours is the generation brought up by frightened women. We had no fathers. All my life I heard just one thing: 'Shhh!.. Don't speak, it's dangerous!.. They'll arrest us, they'll send us away!..' That also played its part...

But here is his cri de coeur. Rumors circulated after 9 April that V. Kotetishvili had died, but he send a bitter denial to MOLODEZH GRUZII: "No, people, I am alive, but what's the point of a life like this?"

But you have to live! So as to tell the truth about what happened. So that the bloodshed and the confrontation never occur again. And so as not to remain aloof but to take a personal stand prompted by the difficult experience of the historical path of our country and the peoples inhabiting it...

Let us return to the Philharmonic Hall, where the final session of the People's Front congress is in progress.

The congress decides to elect a People's Front chairman, although the organizational commission objects to this status of one-man leadership. It was proposed that there be a chairman (or president) but only in a technical capacity. The congress also turned down the proposal to create a Satatbiro [name as transliterated], (the Georgian equivalent of a duma or parliament).

A crucial moment, undoubtedly. What happened during those days of the People's Front congress' work was regarded in the hall as the defeat for the authors of one of the alternative sets of draft statutes—the so-called organizing commission for the preparation of the congress (A. Dzhavakhishvili, M. Mamardashvili, and others). This is the "intellectual center"—the philosophers, lawyers, and historians. But it turned out that this was essentially a first and very significant harbinger of a broad political discussion "face to face." One after another those delegates, who seemed to be a sort of opposition, mounted the platform and talked about the whole complexity of the tasks facing the people's movement, the need to suppress emotions and impatience, to create the political, social, and economic concepts consistently, one step at a time, and to involve in this work representatives of all the nations inhabiting Georgia. They spoke about the cause common to all the peoples of the country—the renewal of state and political structures. That is how they see Georgia's complex path toward true sovereignty and independence.

And when it went to the vote, it emerged that the assembly with its noisy, rally-like atmosphere had indeed bestowed its favors on the "intellectual center." The people who campaigned for balanced approaches and for very difficult and protracted work formed almost the entire board.

...Thus ended the People's Front congress. The heated disputes, the impassioned debates and speeches went on until late evening. One of us flew to Moscow, the other's permanent place of employment is Tbilisi. How can you not visit the Tbilisi bazaar on the way to the airport! It is a different atmosphere there after the crazy prices and hostile secondhand dealers of the Moscow markets. There were mountains of cherries, apricots, peaches, and figs. The first water melons had appeared and there was the appetizing smell of fresh-baked bread. The fruits of a generous earth cultivated by the hands of Georgians and Azerbaijanis, Russians and Armenians, Abkhazians and Ossetians. There are many tongues spoken here but people understand each other well. I would't want this image of friendship to appear purely material. Not only have they long grown crops together on this land, they have also broken bread together. And we are not indifferent either to the future of Georgia or the fate of the peoples living here.

Vlasov Addresses RSFSR Council of Ministers

PM0808140989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Aug 89 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "In the RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] At its 29 July 1989 sitting, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers examined questions concerning the RSFSR's socioeconomic development during the first half of 1989 and discussed information on progress in fulfilling tasks of building and reconstructing facilities in Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic rayons which were damaged by the earthquake.

Detailed accounts of the RSFSR Council of Ministers sitting will be published in the newspaper's forthcoming issues.

The sitting was attended by S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, and V.S. Markaryants, chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers.

The sitting was addressed by A.V. Vlasov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

Kazakh Supreme Soviet Debates Discipline Problems
PM0808133389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by own correspondent V. Ardayev on 27-28 July Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet session]

[Text] The tasks of the republic's soviets in strengthening state and labor discipline in conditions of democratization and glasnost were the main topic of discussion at a routine session of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet on 27-28 July. The debate on the report by Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary N. Nazarbayev revealed diverse, often opposite opinions on the part of the deputies on the matter under discussion.

As well as the irreversible positive processes in society, the report noted, the worrying symptoms associated with the sharp drop in the level of responsibility also have to be mentioned. They are apparent in various spheres—in the economy, in trade and consumer services, in public health, and in law enforcement organs.

The population has been seriously criticizing the organization of urban transport, stores, consumer services, municipal services departments, housing administrations, housing operation offices, identity card desks, and military commissariats, where people spend a lot of free and often working time. Abuses were uncovered in the furniture trade, the sale of air tickets, and commissioning of housing. There was mention of the sharp rise in crime, which was 32 percent over the first 6 months of the year.

The report and speeches stressed the need for the earliest possible demarcation of functions between party and soviet bodies, with all real state power going to the soviets. There was support for the activity of the media geared to combating the old evils of the bureaucratic command system. Deputies devoted much attention to the discussion of various aspects of the problems of interethnic relations.

The session approved a number of Kazakh SSR legislative acts, the discussion of which also took place in a free and democratic atmosphere of sharp polemical debate.

Several new republic Supreme Soviet deputies' commissions were formed, including the commission set up in connection with the events of 17-18 December 1986 in Alma-Ata—for the purpose of ensuring total glasnost in this matter.

As has been reported already, the session appointed Deputy U. Karamanov, former chairman of the republic's State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, as chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers.

Crimean Tatars in Tajikistan Express Concerns
18300726 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 Jul 89 p 2

[Article by Dilyaver Mustafayev, leader of the working group to review statements and appeals from citizens of Crimean Tatar nationality living in Tajikistan: "We Are Waiting For a Just Solution"]

[Text] Until recently the tragedy of the Crimean Tatars was not reflected in the mass media. The numerous published materials on the internationalism and friendship and fraternity of the peoples of the USSR mentioned not a word about the problems of the Crimean Tatars.

More than 20,000 Crimean Tatars of the number dispossessed in the spring of 1944 now live in Tajikistan. To this day they are grateful to the indigenous inhabitants—the Tajiks. It was their sympathy and understanding that enabled them to endure the resettlement.

Throughout the entire period of their exile the Crimean Tatars have been striving to achieve the reinstatement of justice flouted. The more so since the national statehood of a number of peoples who suffered during the period of personality cult and were resettled away from their native lands, was nevertheless subsequently restored. However, only the new political thinking being asseverated in our country has roused the government and the public to pay heed to the aspirations of the Crimean Tatars. We accepted with faith and hope the TASS report that announced that a statehood commission was being set up to examine the entire set of problems being raised in statements from citizens who are Crimean Tatars. But even though that statement recognized that the act of resettlement of all the Crimean Tatars down to the last person was unjust, as in previous times the accent was placed on the negative factors in the history of this people. And this after more than one generation of our children and grandchildren had grown up, after wide publicity had been given to the facts about the outrages and tyranny during the years of the Stalinist repressions.

The TASS report pointed out in particular that according to the available figures, 10 Crimean Tatar volunteer battalions each of 200 to 300 men were operating on the territory of the Crimea, along with 14 regiments. And if we take the documents cited in the book by the historian

A.V. Basov "The Crimea and the Great Patriotic War," then it turns out that the fascists were afraid of creating formations in which there would be a majority of Crimean Tatars. But even if the facts set forth in this report are taken as the truth, then a simple arithmetical calculation shows that many more of my countrymen were in action on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War. According to the official figures about 60,000 Crimean Tatars fought against the fascist invaders, and half of them gave their lives valiantly.

More recently (and in this we also see a sign of the times) articles have been published in the central press that are not biased and one-sided but that objectively and comprehensively describe the Crimean Tatar people. Let me quote an excerpt from one verbatim: "The country knows and remembers everything. It remembers and respects twice Hero of the Soviet Union Sultan Amet-Khan, the heroes Abdraim Reshidov and Tayfuk Adbul and many, many others. It remembers the bearers of the Order of Glory S. Abduramanov and L. Belilyayev, and generals A. Gafarov and I. Bulatov. Nor will it forget the thousands of other glorious names of Crimean Tatars who defended their socialist motherland in the common struggle." The writers S. Barazdin, Ye. Yevtushenko, A. Pristavkin and B. Okudzhava and a group of Uzbek men of letters have spoken out in defense of the Crimean Tatars.

Working groups have been set up in the republics and krays where Crimean Tatars live in order to help the state commission. I was chosen to be the leader of the working group examining the statements and appeals of citizens of Crimean Tatar nationality living in Tajikistan. We have carefully studied all statements that we have received and have generalized them and sent them to the state commission. The demands amount to an organized return of the people to the Crimea, their resettlement in the places in which they historically settled, and compensation for the material harm inflicted during the resettlement, and repeal of the ukase of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Socialist Federated Republic] Supreme Soviet issued in June 1945 on the transformation of the Tatar ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] in Crimean Oblast as unlawful and at variance with the USSR Constitution, and the restoration of the Crimean ASSR as part of the RSFSR.

The Crimean Tatars have been impatiently awaiting the results of the work of the state commission. However, subsequent events have deeply disillusioned us. The reports have contained merely calls to develop and implement in places of compact resettlement of Tatars measures aimed at satisfying more fully their social and everyday and culture needs, further strengthening international and patriotic indoctrination, and raising the standards of interethnic relations. But the report that was published in the press on 9 June 1988 stated that giving due consideration to the demographic and social changes that have taken place in the Crimea during the postwar period, the commission had concluded that there were no grounds for the formation of a Crimean autonomous formation. Thus, the situation when the commission started its work and the situation a year later were the same.

Work for the complete rehabilitation and restoration of the flouted rights of the Crimean Tatars should obviously have been initiated from an ideological consideration of the justice of returning the people to its own motherland and creating favorable psychological attitudes in those living both in the Crimea and in other parts of the country. For this it was necessary to insure objective publicity regarding the question of the Crimean Tatars by the mass media. It was necessary to tell how they drove out the wives and children of those who had gone off to the front in the first days of the war to fight the fascist occupiers in the ranks of the partisans and the underground workers on the occupied territory of the Crimea, and how because of the very difficult conditions and moral deprivations more than one-third of the exiles perished.

I am able to report that 40,000 of my fellow countrymen have already returned to the steppe regions of the Crimea. At the same time the report of the government commission on the growing numerical strength of the Crimea during the postwar period from 780,000 to 2.5 million, that is by a factor of about three, is, in my view, not a convincing argument against the return of the Tatars to their own lands. The territory of the Crimean covers an area of 27,000 square kilometers and the population density is 92 per square kilometer. More than 5 million people live in Tajikistan, which has an area of 143,000 square kilometers. No more than 10 percent of this area is used, that is, 14,300 square kilometers. This means that population density on the used territory is more than 3.5 times greater than in the Crimea. If as many people as already live there resettled in the Crimea, that is, 2,5 million, population density would still be significantly less than in Tajikistan.

The 19th All-Union Party Conference adopted a decision to develop a rule-of-law socialist state. I think that a state cannot be called a rule-of-law socialist state while even one oppressed people lives on its territory, no matter how numerically small it may be. During the long years of their exile the Crimean Tatars have lived with a profound faith that justice will triumph: the time would come when their good name would be restored. And that time is now, and the gaze of the Crimean Tatars is turned toward the upcoming CPSU Central Committee plenum that will consider the question of improving interethnic relations in the USSR. It is pleasing that the demand was made at the Congress of the USSR People's Deputies to restore justice for the Crimean Tatars.

Zaykov Writes on Need for Unity in Perestroyka

PM0808161789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Aug 89 First Edition p 2

[Article by L. Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow City CPSU committee, under the rubric "The Party and Perestroyka": "in unity of will and actions"]

[Text] The process of revolutionary renewal begun in the

country on the party's initiative has embraced all spheres of the life of society. Soviet people actively support perestroyka. This conclusion was confirmed yet again at the recent CPSU Central Committee conference of first secretaries of union republic communist party central committees and of kray and oblast party committees, where basic questions of our work in the course of perestroyka were examined. There was a sharp, open discussion of the party and the way it must act under present conditions. The discussion was necessary and long due, and we are all drawing the necessary conclusions from it. It may be said that the conference documents have become a fulcrum, a reference point in the work of party organizations. It is necessary to study them thoughtfully and back them up with daily deeds without delay. This is what we have done, having discussed these materials with rayon party committee first secretaries and control and auditing commission chairmen.

The sociopolitical situation in Moscow, just as throughout the country, is today determined by the high degree of society's politicization against a background of intensifying economic and social problems. Everything has been significantly complicated, and contradictory opinions, judgments, and views have come to light. A considerable proportion of them could promote the process of creation to some degree. But at the same time there has been increased activity by various kinds of loudmouths and demagogues, who have concentrated exclusively on denial and who fear specific work and personal responsibility as the devil fears incense. They want only to criticize everything and everyone, and let others do the work. Emotions frequently prevail over reason, and it has somehow turned out that words are valued more highly than actions. people who are not indifferent to the cause of socialism and the country's fate are asking a legitimate question: why is this happening?

It is because many party committees are getting away from discussing and resolving urgent problems and prefer to limit themselves to a range of traditional, purely economic questions. And they resolve them from yesterday's positions. As a result, they lose the initiative, and then they lose control of the situation. And people are demanding that the party conduct affairs more boldly, decisively, farsightedly, and successfully. A just demand.

Yes, a process of profound change is under way in the party today. An all-around analysis is being made of real processes, the theory and policy of perestroyka are being developed, and public opinion is being taken more fully into account. A policy of clearly separating the functions of party, state, and economic organs and public organizations is being consistently implemented. The system of internal party relations and the work style and methods are being restructured, and there is less commanding and bureaucratic administration. The organizational structures of the Moscow city party organization have undergone perestroyka, and members of elected organs have formed commissions in the most important areas of work. The party apparatus is changing, and it has been renewed and significantly reduced.

It has to be said that the apparatus of the city party committee [gorkom] is now staffed with highly professional cadres, with people who root for the cause and who wish to work in the new way. However, some people fail to keep up with life in their approaches, their style and methods, and their interpretation of events and phenomena. Relapses into the old way manifest themselves from time to time. And so the process of going over to political leadership methods is taking place only slowly.

I will cite an example. A recent gorkom bureau session examined the question of serious shortcomings in Muscovites' food supplies. A whole chain of Communist leaders reported to the bureau. Unfortunately, as previously, many of them evinced a desire to demonstrate personal activeness and to accuse their neighbor of delays and mistakes. But as regards how to improve Muscovites' food supplies, to establish ties with suppliers, to ensure the efficient working of transport, and to instill order in all components of trade and public catering—they mentioned this in passing, endeavoring to offend and wound no one. Is such a position worthy of a party member?! At that session sharp criticism for inaction was leveled at law-enforcement organs, which have been unable to erect a reliable barrier in the way of mismanagement, violations of the Soviet trade regulations, bribetaking, and thefts of socialist property. Muscovites go to the gorkom and tell of various cases of abuses and thefts. But the law-enforcement organs cannot expose the rogues or seize the bribetakers and speculators in secondhand goods. The gorkom does not intend to supplant the law-enforcement organs, but they must be called to account. Muscovites demand fair toughness toward various kinds of violators and criminals.

Of course, much has been done today to delimit the functions of party, soviet, and economic organs. But this does not mean that the party intends to forget about the very acute questions on which the population's political assessment of the city leaders' "competence" depends. With any separation of functions the CPSU will never "wash its hands" or decline responsibility for the state of order in society or for the improvement of the people's life.

We party workers are criticized for bad street cleaning, although the city municipal services are responsible for this sector. We are criticized for the poor standard of trade, the growth in offenses, the lack of goods in daily demand, and much besides, although here too there are people directly responsible and monitoring organs. Nor do we decline responsibility for all these shortcomings; on the contrary, we will constantly call more strictly to account those persons specifically to blame for all these "punctures." Particularly at the present difficult stage of

perestroyka. Because we see that Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee [gorispolkom], for example, has clearly overlooked control over the fulfillment of its own decisions on stabilization and a qualitative breakthrough in the work of the municipal services sectors which ensure Muscovites' normal working and living conditions. To make a timely, principled assessment of the actions of soviet and economic leaders who undermine people's faith in perestroyka—this too is one method of influencing the situation politically.

The state of affairs can be rectified not only through the skillful selection of cadres but also thanks to their efficient retraining. A package of measures for the radical perestroyka of the activity of Moscow Higher Party School was recently approved at a session of the CPSU Gorkom Commission on Questions of Party Building and Improvement of Cadre Work. The new system is based on contract relations between the educational institution and party committees, on the targeted vocational training of working people, and on rejection of the party schedule approach to the selection of students.

Today more than ever the cause of perestroyka is in need of unity of will and actions and of a high degree of organization and discipline on the Communists' part. Essentially it is a case of every party collective finding its place in the formation and understanding that today it can hold this place as a leader not according to a predetermined ruling but only as a result of a persistent political struggle. Here, it seems to me, is a most complex psychological element which confuses many Communists. Yes, the party as a whole and each of its subdivisions must now assert their authority on all sectors through practical results, defending socialist principles and communist ideals in deeds.

A principled talk about all this took place at the recent Moscow CPSU Gorkom plenum. We deliberately set about making the discussion keener in order to reveal the main sore points, to find the best ways of activating party cadres. The nature of the critical remarks and proposals attests to the fact that at the plenum the emphasis shifted from strictly economic problems to the practice of political party work. I believe that this plenum was successful, a kind of turning point. Painstaking preparation helped to make the plenum successful. All members and candidate members of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom visited the raykoms and primary party organizations, familiarized themselves with their activity, and had heart to heart talks with the Communists. Proposals for discussion at the plenum were worked out in talks with the party aktiv.

For the first time the plenum was broadcast on Moscow television and its materials were published in the city newspapers. That is how the demand of the city's Communists, working people, and inhabitants regarding the development of glasnost in the activity of the party gorkom is being implemented in practice. A broad range of problems was discussed. The idea of the need to start preparation for the 28th party congress was heard repeatedly. This way of putting the question is correct, because many urgent problems have accumulated in our internal party workshop. There is an urgent need for changes to the party statutes and further details are also needed in the CPSU Program. All the proposals must be comprehensively discussed and the opinions of as many Communists as possible must be ascertained.

I think that today the correct choice of direction is more important than anything. Too much haste could result in one-sided or superficial decisions which will have no serious influence on the development of democratic processes in the party. It was for precisely this reason that the Moscow CPSU Gorkom did not support the proposals which were heard to convene a party congress immediately, but took what in our view was the sensible decision to hold a discussion in the city party organization on the CPSU's place and role under the conditions of the political system as it is being renewed and on the development of internal party democracy. Because we felt that the link with the primary party organizations has been weakened and much of what is happening is incomprehensible to rank and file Communists. Hence people's dissatisfaction and the passiveness of entire organizations, which is being used by our opponents who are actively whipping up the thesis that the CPSU is undemocratic. In brief, it is a case not of a short-term campaign but of introducing every Communist and every party organization to the search for the best paths of perestroyka in the party with a view to comprehensively revealing and making all-around use of its potential and the opportunities contained within the socialist social system.

The party organizations' prestige can be raised only on condition that a close link is ensured between Communists and the city's labor collectives and inhabitants. History bears witness that during revolutionary transformations the words uttered with passion by an authoritative leader found a response in the active support of the party of Bolsheviks and were embodied in real deeds. But what are we coming up against now? We have analyzed the protocols of party meetings and the sittings of the party committees of a number of scientific and educational collectives. What has emerged? Criticism of the upper echelons is being overdone everywhere. Everyone looks guilty: the Central Committee, Council of Ministers, gorkom, or raykom. Such criticism is now considered to be good form. But as a rule these meetings and sittings did not level a single word of criticism against their own leaders, against those on whom the critics' material and professional welfare primarily depends. Can the comrades put their hands on their hearts and say that they have restructured themselves?...

We say frankly that during the years of stagnation the party—both its apparatus and its elected organs—were struck by the bureaucratic virus. Living communication with people was replaced by mere formal communication. This could not fail to alienate people from the

party. Overcoming this alienation is not simple. But it is essential. The Moscow party Gorkom has defined as its political task a broad dialogue with various categories and social groups of the capital's inhabitants. The point of this is to ensure that talking directly with people, answering to the questions put by Muscovites, and organizing collaboration to resolve them should become the main thing in the activity of the raykoms, party committees, and all members of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

For instance, the plenum decided that gorkom secretaries, members and candidate members of the Moscow Gorkom and CPSU raykoms, and members of the control and auditing commissions should take a more active part in the "Good Evening, Moscow!" television programs. Immediately after the plenum a "Dialogue" television program was held on its results with the participation of party gorkom secretaries Yu. Prokofyev and Yu. Karabasov. The direct televising was useful, Although it did not avoid some flaws. For instance, was it worth turning such programs into "cross examinations" of party workers? We must improve the standard of debate and seek to ensure that a course is steered toward creation, toward the common weal. We must not drown perestroyka in emotions. The television screen, the radio microphone, and the newspaper page must be used actively for the propaganda of the party's policy and its position on very important questions of internal party life and of the city's socioeconomic development.

Nonetheless the polemic was fruitful. We were convinced that a considerable proportion of the city's population had only a feeble idea of the problems of vital importance to Muscovites which are being resolved by the party gorkom and the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee [Gorispolkom]. People want to know the personal view of a specific city or rayon leader and see him at work. So far, unfortunately, the party workers seldom make statements in the press or on radio and television. The creation of a gorkom press center from which regular television reports would be made will help to some degree to fill the blanks in Muscovites' information about the affairs of the capital's party organization.

Political methods of leadership presuppose the active involvement of the broad masses in the cause of perestroyka and active support for citizens' initiatives. The majority of informal organizations in the city adhere to constructive standpoints and put forward practical proposals for accelerating perestroyka. It is important to find common ground and together to tackle the socioeconomic problems of the development of the city, rayon, or labor collective.

Perestroyka does not admit the suppression of different views. Society's progress is possible only through the struggle of different opinions. And if we communists are convinced that we are right, we must know how to defend this view and prove ourselves right. The recent Moscow City Soviet session, which was focused on the city's ecological situation, was a model of constructive cooperation with different social movements.

Representatives of various ecological organizations and informal associations, leaders of ministries and departments, and USSR people's deputies participated actively in the session. As a result of efforts made on the initiative of the gorkom, Moscow City Soviet, and the public, even before the session it had been possible to implement a series of programs to clean up the environment.

Practice has shown convincingly the bankruptcy of excessive centralization in resolving the problems of urban management. Today there can be no question of imposing real order in Moscow without handing over power to the localities—the rayons and housing districts. Some 86 self-management committees are already in action in the city.

It is quite natural that the atmosphere and tone of the discussion that people are conducting today with the party committees are affected adversely by the difficulties arising from chronic shortages, inflation, rising prices, the deterioration in the ecological situation, serious hitches in the work of municipal services, and shortcomings in the health care system.

The basis for progress in the socioeconomic sphere is the "Progress-95" program. It provides the necessary prerequisites for Muscovites to feel the effects of changes for the better in the social sphere as quickly as possible. The main emphasis is on increasing the output of goods, improving their quality, and expanding the system of paid services. We believe we have in effect acquired a complete, balanced program for the socioeconomic development of Moscow which will be an integral part of the country's 13th 5-Year Plan.

I would like to note a key feature of the program that has been drawn up. It is based on the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. Only on the basis of automation, robotization, and the all-around introduction of computer technology and the latest techniques is it possible to provide the population with food and consumer goods. And also to do away with tedious manual labor and the importation of additional workers to the city. No one but us will resolve these problems.

We seem to have rather forgotten, in the press of everyday affairs, a very important conference that was held at the CPSU Central Committee on 11-12 June 1985. Yet that was when the need for revolutionary transformations in the national economy on the basis of the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, was first mentioned. Only by this means is it possible confidently and reliably to improve the people's living standard and the quality of goods, and we must not depart from it in any way.

We realize that the funds for resolving all the tasks—both economic and social—are extremely limited. Therefore we are devoting particular attention to investments policy, the handling of resources, and their most rational utilization. It is planned to reduce capital investments in new industrial production construction by nearly R2 billion in the 13th 5-Year Plan, and thus to tackle the city's social problems in a more balanced way. At the same time the volume of modernization of enterprises will increase considerably. We pin great hopes on the development of economic reform, in particular the creation of large-scale concerns and joint-stock companies and the development of cooperative and lease relations.

In the current 5-year plan questions of the supply of dairy products to Muscovites will be resolved, and in the next—meat and sausage products. Work is actively under way to organize uninterrupted year-round supplies of fruit and vegetable produce to the city. Concrete measures are planned to increase the output of consumer goods at machine building and defense industry enterprises.

Today we are very worried that rayon soviets and economic leaders, having been granted greater autonomy, are in no hurry to take advantage of it, but are still waiting for detailed instructions and guidance. Yet we are planning to transfer the city and rayons to economic accountability and the new economic management conditions as early as 1990. We should begin with rayon territorial autonomy and the building of economic relations between labor collectives and local management organs. The introduction of territorial economic accountability will make it possible to accelerate the resolution of the city's acute socioeconomic and ecological problems.

Rayon and primary party organizations must have a powerful say here. Discipline and order, along with the introduction of economic and political methods of economic leadership, are the key factor for success. It cannot be denied that while developing the criticism of bureaucratic workers and boosting the level of the masses' independent activity, in many cases we lose sight of the problems of discipline and organization. Many party organizations are totally incapable of abandoning the apathy that has built up over many years. This adversely affects the prestige of not only these organizations themselves. It is worrying that the influx of fresh forces has declined and instances of people leaving the party have become more frequent. We can, of course, console ourselves by saying that it is not the best people who are leaving, you might even think that the party is being purged of the wrong kind of people. But I am in no hurry to make such generalizations, although analysis shows that such cases do occur.

If you carefully examine every such case, you see how complex and contradictory the picture is. And the way out of this situation is, in our view, not simple. The problem cannot be resolved by any kind of emergency measures—be it the purge proposed by some communists, or sociopolitical certification. The party has already gone through all that. In my view only real progress in the ideological, economic, and social spheres can restore and augment the party's magnetic force. That is how we are now approaching the question of the quality of the party's ranks.

Today more than ever before, Communists must close ranks and be in the vanguard of perestroyka. The main thing is not to allow the processes of democratization in society to be extinguished. And, by every method of political work in our arsenal, to maintain the high pitch of activeness among Muscovites and channel Soviet people's energy and initiative into the constructive renewal of the socialist society.

Solovyev Reportedly Resigned '3 Months Ago'

18001388 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Jul 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "An Outsider?"]

[Text] **It turns out that Yu.F. Solovyev, recently in charge of the Leningrad party organization, "applied for retirement" 3 months ago.**

It is not difficult to figure out: This happened immediately after the elections of USSR people's deputies, during the course of which a number of city and oblast leaders suffered a crushing defeat. A step which was understandable from a human standpoint and worthy from a civic standpoint. But Leningraders learned about this only now, along with another piece of news: The plenum of the CPSU obkom [oblast committee] elected Boris Veniaminovich Gidaspov as first secretary.

The election was unexpected for many. Above all it was nontraditional. Let us recall: Yu.F. Solovyev, before taking over the obkom, headed the city party committee and worked as minister for a long time. His predecessor, L.N. Zaykov, was previously the chairman of the Lensovet [Leningrad city soviet]. The person who has now been elected first secretary is in general far removed from the apparatus: a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, general director of the GIPKh (State Institute of Applied Chemistry) Association, and chairman of the board of Tekhnokhim—one of the two interbranch associations created in Leningrad. Perhaps one should not take too literally the name of the play by I. Dvoretskiy which made a stir at one time—"The Outsider": B.V. Gidaspov was still a member of the obkom bureau. But still it is not without reason that this play comes to mind.

"In my opinion Gidaspov's candidacy has three decisive advantages," said the writer D. Granin, speaking at the plenum. "In the first place he is a scientist, and a good scientist who is working... This is good. Because the city's scientific and technical potential is great and

complicated. The second advantage of Gidaspov, in my view, is that he is an independent person and he has an adequate reputation both as a scientist and as a leader and organizer to feel independent in this post. And third: He has good experience in successful organizational work.

And here are a couple of opinions in response to questions from the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent.

G. Semibratov, candidate of technical sciences, director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute (VNIITI):

"I, too, found the election unexpected, for only experienced party workers had been mentioned as possible candidates (both at the plenum and simply in conversations). But now, when assessing the present situation, I see that it is not simple to find the best candidate for a party organization of such a city as Leningrad where there are hundreds of institutes alone."

A. Golutva, director of Lenfilm:

"To tell the truth, in purely human terms I feel sorry for Boris Veniaminovich. For he has left a great scientific project, a new one which was barely started—Tekhnokhim, his fellows, his students.... But the situation in the Leningrad party organization is so complicated and contradictory—I would say critical—that its leadership is in need of 'fresh blood,' it needs a person with original thinking and modern views of life. It is another matter that this problem should have been solved before now."

Yu. Andreyev, writer, doctor of philological sciences, editor-in-chief of "Poet's Collection":

"It seems to me that this election was a step in the right direction. Precisely a step. But a wise step which reduces tension in the city and strengthens confidence in the center. Leningraders cannot but notice that M.S. Gorbachev participated in the work of the obkom plenum. Why only a step? Because I wish to believe that this is the beginning of other changes.

Chebrikov, Lukyanov Attend Anti-Crime Meeting

LD0808164189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1605 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow, 8 Aug (TASS)—A meeting of the provisional committee on the battle against crime, which was created by the USSR Supreme Soviet, took place in Moscow today under the chairmanship of Anatoliy Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

As was emphasized at the meeting, law enforcement bodies must immediately take the necessary measures to reliably ensure the protection of public property and safety of citizens. Attention should primarily be paid to strengthening practical work, preventing infringements of the law, and motivating the public and labor collectives.

The provisional committees on the battle against crime in the union and autonomous republics, krays, oblasts, and towns are to develop and present the necessary plan by the beginning of September aimed at decisively overcoming the causes for violations of the law and ensuring strict punishment of criminals.

Viktor Chebrikov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke at the committee meeting.

Bakatin on Militia, Crime Problems, Interpol Ties

LD1607222189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1120 GMT 16 Jul 89

[From the "View" program]

[Text] There was a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs press center on 11 July. The briefing was held by Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs, who had the day before been confirmed in this post by the Supreme Soviet. After the briefing, Vadim Viktorovich gave us an interview.

[Begin recording] [Bakatin] The crime situation in the country is very serious at the moment. Yesteday I even used the expression "crime crisis" because the crime rate is, in reference to serious crime, up 39.9 percent over last year for the first 6 months of the year. This rate is very high in itself. This has been the case for something like 3 or 4 years. The rate has been close to that in our recent past. These rates are therefore very high, but there is something else more worrying: The rate of growth in unsolved crimes is 3.4 times greater than the rate of increase in the crimes themselves. Nonetheless, today we do have sufficient forces, and there is the opportunity to regroup these forces and direct them toward immediate detective work, toward stepping up the fight against crime. The Ministry of Internal Affairs is contemplating adopting such measures very quickly and efficiently. Of course, I do not know to what extent this will succeed in restraining a further rise in crime, but we will nonetheless be doing this work.

The militiaman is also faced today with very many problems concerning greater demands or higher criteria. That is a fact. However, you woll agree that it is also very important today for us to be very strong physically and trained to a very professional standard, because crime is becoming more professional.

[Reporter] It is becoming more refined....

[Bakatin] Yes, it is becoming more refined, it is not simple as it was earlier. Crime today is a complex matter and so we need more knowledgeable people to combat it. And, I repeat, from the point of view of political and cultural criteria, these criteria are increasing. So the militia simply has to be better staffed with, pardon me, much better people. However, for this to be the case they have to be better paid, and they should have a good position, with respect, in society. I have got with me somewhere...[pulls a badge from his pocket showing a cartoon militia man with an angry face next to a red fist captioned "democracy"] This, for example, was on sale in a certain market in Riga—that is democracy. There is the militia man, and the militia man is being beaten with the fist in the guise of democracy. Who needs this kind of attitude toward the militia, who die in order to defend Soviets? Who needs this, just to feel immune from punishment?

And it is the moral discrediting of the militia that is worst of all. These are men who work without days off, not recognizing the frost in winter when on the streets, who when necessary risk their lives, ultimately, the majority of them, at least, who... [Bakatin changes thought] maybe it is a question of culture, that is something else. It will all come in time, we have to work on that, but nonetheless the selflessness of the majority of militia officers probably cannot be denied today.

These are our people, where have they come from? They have not come to us from nowhere, somewhere else, not from abroad. They are also men from the people, these are the very same fellows who served in the army, who were in Afghanistan, and what are they today? What have they done to deserve such a lack of respect, what is it for? Just because among them there is, say, some kind of group of bribe-takers, corrupt elements and so on. There may be hooligans, and there are also criminals among the militia, but not all of them. So I think that this myth of not being protected by the law—and I am talking about a kind of amoral protection—has been created here by the mass media.

[Reporter] By the way, what about international links? Tell me, will the Ministry of Internal Affairs cooperate with Interpol?

[Bakatin] It will. [end recording]

Briefing Highlights Continued Crime Wave

18001348 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 8 Jul 89 p 4

[Report by I. Baranovskiy: "Our Ways Are No Better"]

[Text] Every day in the country there are six murders, five rapes, and 260 thefts. Each hour there are six hooligan escapades, six muggings, and one case of severe bodily harm.

Previously these statistics were published under the rubric "Their Ways." But these figures, unfortunately, were taken from our Soviet crime files. Yesterday A. Logvinov, head of the Main Administration for Maintenance of Public Order of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], released them to journalists.

What is surprising is that crime in the country is on the rise but measures taken against criminals are becoming less stringent. Thus last year 470,000 criminals were released and 450,000 were convicted without incarceration. The criminological situation has become considerably more complicated. According to A. Logvinov's figures, the size of the high-risk group, which includes drug addicts, prostitutes, and alcoholics, the group from which most of the criminal element comes, is gradually approaching in size the number of population of an average European country. Today it consists of 7 million people.

The chief of the Main Administration for Combating Theft and Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation, V. Runyshkov, also spoke at the meeting. He announced that in 1988 alone the state lost 4 billion rubles because of theft and shortages in payments. Of course this figure is highly relative.

Committee Protests 'Zionist's Union'

LD0808191989 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS—The Presidium of the Anti- Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public has strongly denounced the attempts by some individuals in the USSR to create a certain socio- political organisation, "The Zionists' Union".

A statement by the Anti-Zionist Committee, released here, stresses that the realisation of the goal of this "union", whose organisers stake on wooing away part of Soviet Jews from the involvement in perestroika, on their notorious 'Israelisation', would only result in kindling anti-Jewish sentiments in the country.

This is the very case when warlike Zionism, which was proclaimed by the United Nations Organisation a form of racism and racial discrimination, is used against the interests of the Jewish working people and in practice joins ranks with rabid antisemitism, the statement says. The attempt to set up the "union" is a deliberate stoking up of tension in inter-ethnic relations.

Unofficial Workers Groups Meet

18280156 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 29, 19 Jul 89 p 2

[Article by L. Grafova: "What Is the Workers Union To Be Like?"]

[Text] This is what representatives of informal workers' associations who came to Moscow from 23 cities of the country spent 2 days arguing about.

There were about 150 of them. The AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] paid for the business trips and the hotel. However, the idea was "grassroots." Besides, this idea—to unite—is now in the air. An inter-city workers' club came up with the initiative of the meeting. The club was set up 2 years ago for a specific cause—workers from various cities decided to support the gas and electric welder from Riga Vladimir Bogdanov, who was fired for "refractoriness." This is how they found one another.

As early as last summer, I happened to be present at their meeting. Then it was mostly grievances that were aired: Supposedly, we have a dictatorship of the proletariat; why then is the working-class community the one with the fewest rights and the one most defenseless? Calls for help.... At the Yaroslavl Engine Plant, the struggle against the dominance of "Black Saturdays" peaked at the time. Now people from Yaroslavl came here as winners; they have a strong workers' club. Much has already been done in Zelenograd by a social and legal defense group. There already are unions of workers in Lithuania and Latvia; soon there will be one in Belorussia....

At present, the tone of the conversation is different. The pleading tone is gone. "Let us not take an inventory of our bruises and bumps! It is more important to discuss the methods of struggle." They have already been developed: how the workers should gain genuine power in the councils of labor collectives, how to create volunteer personnel departments at enterprises, how not to to participate in the lies of socialist competition for the purposes of window-dressing. So, the AUCCTU is offering support to the workers' movement, but don't they want...to buy us off? However, someone immediately recalls with indignation: After all, the trade unions exist for our money!

The speech of the Head of Department at the AUCCTU S. Kramarenko was heard with reserve, though he spoke about what is the most acute—a draft law expanding the rights of trade unions, about the fact that the current session of the Supreme Soviet will discuss the Law on Strikes. "Why hasn't this draft been published? Again, someone wants to resolve something without us...."

However, at present this is not going to be successful anymore. Two people's deputies, workers N. Belous and K. Uoka, took part in the meeting. They were asked to bring to the attention of the Supreme Soviet an appeal adopted at the meeting: We demand to suspend the application of norms added to the labor legislation by the ukase dated 4 February as unconstitutional and infringing on the rights of workers.... Also: We demand explanations (through the press) as to who is going to convene the workers' congress mentioned at the Congress of People's Deputies and how.

I was surprised: Turns out that these workers do not want to push through their congress. "The grass roots" are not yet ready ("unfortunately, we are still the most inert mass..."), and tamed activists may again adopt any anti-democratic resolutions "on behalf of the workers."

Indeed, some people understand the word "front" too literally.... It is advantageous for someone to set the workers against the intelligentsia. We are sick of fighting! "We have destroyed so much already. At present, we need painstaking constructive work...." So, they went away so that everyone would do such work where he lives. An organizational committee for preparing a new meeting (early next year) has been elected. An information center of the workers' movement is beginning to operate at the journal SOVETSKIYE PROFSOYUZY. It will be headed by worker correspondent Albert Speranskiy (incidentally, a LITERATURNAYA GAZETA author), who has left his plant for this purpose.

P.S.—On the day this issue was published, I called the information center: Do you have fresh news from the Kuzbass strikers? Speranskiy answered that he was flying there the next day to get the news first-hand. "Our organizational committee believes that this miners' strike raises the 'workers' issue' to the level of sharpness and significance it really merits."

Rostov Party Leaders Meet With Informal Groups

18001424 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 25 Jul 89 p 1

[Article by Yu. Belanov (Rostov-on-Don): "Things Have Started Moving"]

[Text] **A far from ordinary event took place in the House of Political Education in Rostov-on-Don. For the first time representatives of informal groups, who even yesterday were out of favor, sat down at the same presidium table with party obkom [oblast committee] secretaries. And immediately whispers could be heard in the packed hall: Have things really started moving?**

"I think that all of us 'formal' and 'informal' group members have to be alarmed by the empty counters in the stores and the critical shortage of housing," the first secretary of the party obkom, B. Volodin, addressed those gathered at the meeting. "Shall we begin with that, Comrades?"

"No!" everyone in the hall categorically agreed.

Representatives of practically all the informal groups and clubs in the Don area did not come to this meeting in order to "scare up" an extra portion of goods that are in short supply at the trade bases. The speakers talked about things that people understand: The numerous holes in the food and housing programs cannot be patched up in one fell swoop. This takes time, money, and a considerable amount of effort on the part of all the people. But something else is also clear: No additional

reserves will be required for unwavering observance of socialist laws and social justice or for the development of true democracy and self-administration of the people. And the leaders of the informal groups put the question, as it were, point blank:

"When will Rostov cease to be a 'refuge for the unsinkable' a 'cordoned-off zone'"?

Even in these perestroyka days they have given no peace to the Rostov informal group members. One of the speakers said that he had been "sent to the slammer" simply because he had tried to show in public a homemade poster that called for justice for those guilty of the tragedy in Tbilisi. There is no doubt that the name of the active participant in the "Defense" [Zashchita] group, S. Velikoredchanin, deserves to be recorded in the "Guiness Book of Records." It is no laughing matter: To resolve a simple labor conflict he was forced to go...through 300 judicial investigations!

The adolescent club "Interlocutor" [Sobesednik], which for some reason is out of favor with the Novocherkassk party gorkom [city committee], has already been closed down 26 times! What is so surprising here if those who seek justice, who for years have left no stone unturned in the legal organs, publicly express a lack of confidence in the chairman of the oblast court, V. Panichev. I think it is not without justification that there has been an uproar about this in the editorial mail as well.

I awaited with special interest the speech of Yu. Dombrovskiy, doctor of sciences, USSR State Prize winner, and university professor. I recall that during the days of the pre-election campaign a letter came to the correspondence point, in which the students requested that their candidate be protected from arbitrary treatment. Hooligans incited by someone had thrown rocks at the windows of Yuriy Anatolyevich's apartment. Only after repeated attempts did they manage to finally get the propaganda leaflets from the printer. And during the meeting in support of the candidate representatives of the city authorities ripped from the backs of the students the posters showing his pre-election program. Perhaps there was something seditious in it? Judge for yourself; it was only six large words: "Clean air. A healthy economy. Free people!" What was it about the university professor that the authorities did not like? That he had voluntarily taken upon himself an immense burden—the social ecological center—and shouted about the pain at the top of his voice.

Now Yu. Dombrovskiy is again speaking about the serious concern of his compatriots about the construction of the Rostovskaya AES [nuclear electric power station]; about the inability of the local soviets to protect from industrial wastes the "Quiet Don" which has already been harmed in any case....

This meeting of the Rostov party and informal group leaders was in some ways similar to the recent USSR Congress of People's Deputies. There was the same waiting line for the microphone. There was the same extreme sincerity of opinions and positions....

The frank exchange of opinions in the House of Political Education ended at about midnight. And in the morning the next plenum of the party obkom discussed the political results of the April (1989) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. According to the evaluations of the local press, the plenum of Don communists worked differently this time: Instead of the traditional hour-long paper there was a brief statement and concluding word from the first secretary of the obkom. Alas, this is where the innovative spirit of its organizers ended. Beyond this everything proceeded in the same old rut: the same toothless criticism on paper of "certain blunders on the part of certain party leaders."

I listened carefully to the "weighed" statements of participants in the plenum and I am not sure: Did none of them really know about the millions of tons of much-needed coal that were standing around in the railroad tunnels? Why did nobody say a word about the fact that the Don miners are living and working under the same conditions as their Kuzbass comrades? Why did they not have enough courage to get up and say: There is no time for long speeches now! Let us go to the miners, to the mining villages. Perhaps an honest and open conversation with the people would have prevented a strike at the largest Rostov mine, imeni 60-Letiye Leninskiy Komsomol, which began the next day after the plenum. In words it seemed that they had assimilated the serious lessons of the first congress of deputies—the fact that the party is lagging behind significantly in perestroyka. But in reality, the party has not taken control of events any more than it did before. Apparently it has not learned a lesson even from the a gaping sore—the recent demonstration of Rostov residents that broke out spontaneously because of critical social problems about which SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA has written repeatedly. In the big picture how is this "new" plenum different from the party forums of the years of stagnation?

When I returned to the correspondence point I turned on the dictaphone with a tape recording of the statements of the informal group members. And it was immediately as though the walls had moved aside—this was life itself with its joys, concern, and pain bitterly and persistently knocking on the door of our common home. The people suggest so much that is practical!

And it seems that one cannot but agree with their demand: Under the conditions of the unprecedented politicization of all social segments, it is necessary to stop persecuting them or obstructing the gathering force of the informal movement on the Don. And there must be a party evaluation of the work of the editors of the local newspapers MOLOT and VECHERNIY ROSTOV,

which for more than 2 decades have been publishing articles in which, as it were, they really beat up the informal groups. It is necessary to open the doors of the House of Political Education for discussion of all pressing problems within the framework of the country's Basic Law. And the forthcoming elections to the local soviets of people's deputies should be considered a primary task, and they should be conducted on the basis of real sovereignty of the people and democracy....

In a brief article it is impossible to discuss everything that took place in the first meeting of the Don informal group members and the party leaders. What is important is how it was regarded by party leaders.

"I do not think there were any statements today," said B. Volodin, "which could not at least be taken under advisement. I shall definitely inform all members of the bureau of the results of our meeting...."

Well, it has long been time for the society's political vanguard to make up for arrears in perestroyka, which was discussed directly at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies and at the recent conference in the CPSU Central Committee. And the first good news is already arriving from the heartland. Recently representatives of informal groups were allowed to speak at the plenum of the Volgodonsk CPSU gorkom. It would seem that the party leaders of the Don have not only listened but have finally heard the informal group members, among whom there are many people with initiative whose hearts are devoted to perestroyka.

New Customs Regulations Take Effect 15 Aug

PM0808143189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Aug 89 Second Edition p 6

[V. Chertkov report: "New Customs Duties. We Report the Details"]

[Text] V. Boyarov, chief of the USSR Council of Ministers Main Administration for State Customs Control, held a press conference yesterday for Soviet and foreign journalists. He announced that new regulations governing citizens' imports and exports of goods, valuables, and currency to and from the USSR will be introduced as of 15 August 1989. We will acquaint you with just a few of them.

Subjects destined for sale, exchange, leasing, and use to obtain income may be imported into the USSR provided customs duty is paid.

The regulations envisage that objects of considerable artistic, historical, scientific, and other cultural value, including religious objects may be imported into the USSR duty-free and without restriction.

Citizens can export without restriction objects bought in the USSR at special stores and trading organizations, using foreign currency. Concessionary changes have been made to the provisions which determine the procedure for importing foreign automobiles into the USSR. The duty has been reduced by one-third and the period of time during which the right to sell them is restricted has been halved.

The new regulations have established a preferential regime for importing gifts. The value of the gifts that may be imported duty free (R500) is 400 percent above the norm laid down by the New York convention on customs concessions. The value of the gifts is added together for relatives traveling together.

Gifts to a higher value may be brought into the USSR provided duty is paid.

While work was under way on the new regulations, more modern customs control equipment was being prepared for introduction . A system of "green" and "red" corridors is being introduced at Moscow's Sheremetyevo-1 and Sheremetyevo-2 airports and also at Riga's airport and sea port. This system presupposes that citizens who do not have objects requiring customs clearance on them or in their unaccompanied baggage do not fill out a customs declaration and proceed through the "green" corridor.

More than half of the overall current rates of duty have been reduced. The duty on a whole series of objects in high demand has been reduced, These include fabrics, yarn products, underwear and outerwear, automobile spare parts, tape recorders, video cassettes, photographic materials, perfume, and cosmetics.

In view of domestic consumer prices, customs rates have only been raised on imported personal computers, sound synthesizers, and electronic keyboards whose value exceeds legally obtained foreign currency or which have been obtained as a gift.

The new regulations and customs tariffs will be extended to Soviet and foreign citizens as well as citizens without citizenship entering or leaving the USSR for any purpose such as: health; visits to relatives and friends; performance of official duties; education; business; practical work, and so on.

Individual Property Rights Clarified

18001366 Moscow NEDELYA in Russian No 27, 3-9 Jul 89 p 15

[Article by Doctor of Jurisprudence Raisa Khalfina: "Personal Property"]

[Text]**"Private owner"—this is what we usually call the owner of an automobile, a seller at the kolkhoz [collective farm] market, the people all around us who provide everyday services, etc. But after all, everybody knows that there is no private property in the country. There is, however, personal property, the right to which is secured**

in the USSR Constitution. How, then, does personal property differ from private property? How is it that the word "private owner" is not infrequently pronounced with malicious irony?

The 1977 USSR Constitution secured personal property as the single form of individual property, establishing that "labor derived income comprises the basis of citizens' personal property." (Article 13).

How does the law regulate personal property relations?

Citizens' personal property is designated for the satisfaction of their material and cultural requirements in accordance with the tastes, desires, and inclinations of each.

The linkage of personal property with social property provides for the unity of interests of the individual and society. The more completely and better the social economy grows, the greater the capacity of personal property of society's members to fulfill their needs.

Unfortunately, serious deformations in payment for labor, the insufficiency of the pension provisions, and the underestimation of each person's labor contribution frequently violate this unity. There appear people (and sometimes even groups) which, by criminal means, plunder social property and openly use the unjust spoils. In this is one of the reasons for the negative relation to personal property. But it must not be forgotten: Unjustly gained property is not personal property. The right of property must have a legal foundation (a "title"—in Soviet legislation).

One of the basic characteristics of personal property rights is its consumer nature. The USSR Constitution contains a list of what may be personal property. These are everyday objects, personal consumer items, household conveniences, a residence, saved earnings; this is not an exhaustive list.

Everything which is not excluded from civil circulation can be an object of personal property.

The size and objective composition of personal property is not limited in the Constitution. Its labor basis is the only necessary condition. In addition, individual exceptions which are fixed in the law are established in the legislation of the union republics. Thus, it is established in all union republics that the citizen's personal property may include only one residence; the size limit of this residence is fixed in a number of republics, and the quantity of livestock in the subsidiary farm is limited.

The Constitution establishes that assets in the citizens' private property must not serve to extract nonlabor-derived income, or to use it to harm society's interests.

But life itself presents a mass of unusual situations. For example, the USSR Savings Bank pays interest on deposits; several enterprises and cooperatives have recently begun to issue stocks and bonds by which the bearers accrue interest, and this applies to state loans as well. Should the receipt of such interest be viewed as nonlabor-derived income? Some lawyers propose to make a distinction between nonlabor-derived and illegal income, feeling that in the given case, the law permits nonlabor-derived income. However, in my view, this is not so. In participating in a loan, obtaining stock, or leaving money on deposit, the citizen is refusing to satisfy one need or another, and is restricting himself as a consumer. This also serves as the basis for the receipt of certain compensation in the proportion established by the law.

The issue of whether the pay received by the citizen for the rental of his property, most frequently residential space, is nonlabor-derived income has completely practical significance. This is all clear at first glance: In granting someone use of his property, the property owner incurs no labor expenses. But on the other hand, he declines to use his own property (or considerably limits himself), and this can, and probably must be compensated accordingly. Therefore, the law permits payment of rent for rooms in houses and dachas belonging to private property owners. The rental payments are determined by the parties' agreement, but must not exceed the rate limits established by the union republics. In practice, these rates are most frequently determined by the ispolkoms [executive committees] of the local soviets. Life has shown that in the overwhelming majority of cases they are so low that they cannot in any way reimburse a person for the inconveniences associated with denying oneself use of a room. As a result, they have stopped taking these rates into account.

To combat nonlabor-derived income, norms have been included in the legislation of all union republics which stipulate the seizure by court procedures of assets acquired through nonlabor-derived income. Such assets include a residence, dacha, and automobile. The Civil Codes of Armenia and Kazakhstan also cite "other valuable property." These articles of the civil code of the union republics were adopted in the early sixties. However, they never played a noticeable role in the struggle against nonlabor-derived income.

It is no accident that many lawyers now differ in their opinion that the "nonworking" norm must simply be abolished. It seems that in the rule-of-law state now being created, this issue must be resolved not only by administrative, but by tax measures.

Personal property is protected by all means at the disposal of the law. If something is stolen from a property owner, or taken illegally by other means, it must be returned to him. If, as the result of delusion, deception, threat, or a concurrence of unfavorable circumstances, a citizen concluded a contract or committed some other act infringing upon his property rights, that agreement or

action will be acknowledged to be invalid through a court proceeding; property rights will be restored, and losses and expenses will be recompensed.

The law obligates reimbursement at the expense of the guilty party for damage caused to assets. The property owner may demand the removal of all obstacles to the use and allocation of the assets owned by him.

The right to personal property is one of the basic rights of citizens. It must be implemented in accordance with its economic, political, and social essence.

Goskompriroda Chief Explains Retirement
18300744 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jul 89 pp 1, 4

[Interview with F.T. Morgun, chairman of Goskompriroda, by V. Peskov: "Retirement...Why?"

[Text] [Peskov] Fedor Trofimovich, it seems that the rumors are being confirmed. Are you going to retire?

[Morgun] Yes, you can say that the matter has been decided. As early as May I learned that the leadership of the USSR Council of Ministers intended to bring younger people into the government and submit their names for the approval of the USSR Supreme Soviet. This decision is undoubtedly correct. I fully agree with it. I also knew that they intended to recommend an ecologist for the post of chairman of Goskompriroda [State Committee for Protection of Nature]. I fully share this desire.

[Peskov] Retirement is an important landmark in life. How do you feel about it?

[Morgun] Well, how can I put it precisely: relatively calm. The time when one goes on a pension is probably not the most pleasant for anyone, especially those who feel that they are still capable of working productively.

[Peskov] So why are you doing it?

[Morgun] The fact is, Vasiliy Mikhaylovich, in my previous posts, although they were not simple or easy either, I daresay I knew my job thoroughly, I felt confident, and work was always something I desired and found interesting. In spite of the 12-hour and sometimes longer work day, I was never tired. But here I ended up in the position of an older student; there was much that was new and unfamiliar. Literally on the run I had to study the specifics of industrial productions, and old and new technologies—metallurgical, chemical, energy. I had to know what was crucial, where, and why, and what to do without making any mistakes. Every day I encountered dozens of unfamiliar terms and concepts. In places where an ecologist could take everything in his stride, easily, I had to look at every little thing, get explanations, and ask questions. At times I simply felt awkward. And nothing was being done in the committee. It had to be created while solving a multitude of economic, organizational, and personnel problems. Some people will say: So what; one must learn; all of life is a learning process. This is true. I think this myself. I have learned all my life and not without success. But you must understand me: It is not easy at age 65 for an agronomist to learn metallurgy or chemical technology.

[Peskov] But when they took you on board they were well aware of your age. Incidentally, Fedor Trofimovich, what do you yourself think—why was it namely Morgun who was selected?

[Morgun] I think it was because all the work that had been assigned to me I had done fairly well. I have experience in party and economic work. And also because, of course, in matters concerning the protection of nature I hold firm positions based on principles. Protective soil cultivation without plows which we managed to introduce in the Poltava area and a number of other oblasts is a reliable method of protecting fertile soil from degradation. This concern is not only for current needs but also to make sure that our grandchildren do not have to go without bread. Advanced agricultural technology was not introduced without a fight. And I was never afraid of a fight.... The selection was not random. As concerns my age, I probably seemed young and strong.

[Peskov] And what did you yourself think at that moment?

[Morgun] I shall tell you honestly: I had no ambitions. Things in the Poltava area were proceeding normally but there was a lot that I wanted to improve. I was aware that retaining the fertility of the soil was my life's main work. Perestroyka strengthened my position as first secretary of the party obkom [oblast committee] and a professional agronomist in agrarian affairs. So I did not want to move from my spot. When they called me to Moscow I reminded them of my age, of course, but they said to me: "Fedor, you must...." The very fact of the conversation played a role. It coincided with the discussion in the CPSU Central Committee of the events in Nagorno-Karabakh and Sumgait. I waited almost all day to be received—the work rhythm and the situation in the Central Committee were extremely strained and urgent measures had to be taken. Officials from Azerbaijan and Armenia were called to Moscow to participate in the discussion of the measures. I had a keen sense of how incredibly overworked the people were and felt how difficult it now was for everybody from top to bottom. In this situation I decided not to make a point of my age or the fact that I had "my own work" in the Poltava area.

[Peskov] Your appointment to head the newly created committee evoked no doubts either on the part of the government or on the part of the public and the scientific community. They were glad to hear your name because they knew of the authority you enjoyed, your ability to work, your adherence to principles, and your positions

with respect to the protection of nature. The explanation of the current situation by the limitations of your age is sincere and convincing. But the post of chairman of the committee is known to be filled with conflict. Is it possible that these conflicts determined your fate?

[Morgun] Well, what can I tell you—it is not easy to be a leader in the country today. As concerns the head of the committee for the protection of nature, this post is dramatic. On the one hand there is public indignation regarding all that has been done to nature and the environment in which we live. It is justified indignation. On the other hand, we must increase production—plants, factories, and electric power stations must operate in order to satisfy our essential needs. Add to this the catastrophic shortages of funds. (And protecting nature means expenditures, and large ones!) Thus the newly created committee ended up between a rock and a hard place. This is the springboard of conflict. The particulars arising from this led, of course, to constant squabbles about the leadership of the department. It is impossible to enumerate these squabbles. I shall use as an example just one major conflict related to the production of nutritive protein out of petroleum products. This initially deceptive direction of work costing tens of billions of rubles was actively supported by eminent scientists of the USSR Academy of Sciences, VASKhNIL [V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences], and the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee]. In the leading institutes many detailed works were written to defend this "protein industry." Plants were built which caused economic and ecological problems everywhere. One of these plants was "planted" in our Poltava area and I knew from hearsay that it was one of these. For 10 years now I have been trying to prove that these billions of rubles were spent in far from the best way. If these funds had been invested in agriculture for raising pulse crops or in the production of equipment for harvesting and storing feeds, the state would have been much better off. And we would have avoided the explosion of ecological passions that are constantly being observed in Kirishi, Angarsk, Novopolotsk, and other cities. After I became the head of the committee, at meetings of the Council of Ministers, of course, I said what I thought, and I remained...in the depressing minority or, rather, in severely criticized solitude. This was one of the conflicts.

[Peskov] But recently at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov expressed ideas about protein production that coincide with your viewpoint.

[Morgun] Yes, I listened to this with a great deal of attention. And, of course, I was very glad about the decision that was made to halt the construction of new plants and to change the profiles of existing ones.

[Peskov] Logic demands that I ask this question: If you were right in this major conflict, why am I speaking with you as a person who is going into retirement?

[Morgun] Vasiliy Mikhaylovich, I wish to emphasize that this is not a matter of conflicts, no matter how they may be resolved. These conflicts are natural. A committee chairman who would try to avoid them would not be worth his salt. The fact is that we are returning to the beginning of our discussion—that it is too late for me to engage in large conflicts and seriously learn industrial technologies. There was no conflict in deciding the issue of my retirement. Everything went smoothly. But some unfamiliar feeling appeared in my soul. But who does not know sorrow today! The main thing is to arrange things properly in the state—and as quickly as possible.

[Peskov] I read that you had worked in Moscow for 15 months. Can you speak about anything you accomplished?

[Morgun] Of the 15 months, 9 should perhaps be subtracted. Just a half year ago after an immense amount of difficulty the committee was finally given premises. But a good deal was done during this short period of time. The formation of the committee, the selection of personnel, all kinds of arrangements, the development of a concept of the protection of nature, the formation of lower organs of the committee, participation in the work of the Council of Ministers, emergency putting out of all kinds of ecological fires. This is a job. And not a small one. During this time I visited many places in the country in order to become familiar with the ecological situation on the spot. For the purpose of "training" I visited the United States, the FRG, Finland, and Sweden. I can say frankly that these 15 months of my life have been the most difficult. But I would not like for anyone to get the idea that I am running away from difficulties. No, that is not in my nature.

[Peskov] What have you learned and what have you come to understand during these 15 months?

[Morgun] I have understood and have become convinced that the amount of economic activity will increase. Scientists think that during our children's lifetime the population will double and production will increase again by a factor of 5. If this increase is achieved on the basis of aging technologies nature will not be able to hold up under the onslaught of violations. Naturally, our country must avoid this as well.

In order to get out of our current ecological disaster we need extreme efforts and a very large amount of money. We are not the first to encounter this problem. The upsurge of ecological awareness at the end of the sixties and the beginning of the seventies took place in the United States. The strong economy, science which was oriented toward ecological problems, and, of course, money helped to cope with the disasters there—saving the Great Lakes alone cost 17 billion dollars. We shall have to solve a similar problem under incomparably more difficult circumstances.

Now many people understand and I have also understood: The salvation of nature lies in the replacement of outdated industrial technologies with new ones that spare nature and are less energy-intensive. The protection of nature is unthinkable without this. Because of our poverty we cannot take radical measures immediately. But we must at least restrain the development of especially dangerous productions. This pertains primarily to certain ecologically dangerous directions in the development of chemistry, energy engineering, and, strange as it may seem, automotive construction. We are actively increasing the production of motor vehicles but we have done very little to make the motor vehicles ecologically clean. This problem is being solved successfully throughout the world. In our cities the automobile is the main source of pollution.

For a long time nature was the victim in all of our works and plans. We have economized, left work unfinished, and written off losses at her expense. And all this was done under the pharisaical slogan "Multiply the riches of nature!" We "multiplied" them. Today when considering any plan we must ask this question: How will this affect the condition of the water, air, soil, plant life, the animal kingdom and, ultimately, the health of man?

Construction and development are hardly possible without damage to nature. But we must strive to reduce the damage to a minimum. And this takes intelligence and ecological culture. We have almost none of either of these. Many problems come from our industrial heritage, but much is the result of stupidity, ignorance, slovenliness, a lack of elementary knowledge, and the habit of putting everything off until later. We must learn!

Much can be said about a general ecological education. I can see what steps should be taken. But now my successor will have to deal with this.

[Peskov] Do you know him?

[Morgun] Not yet. I heard that four academicians one after the other were asked to take the position. They refused.

[Peskov] What would you like to see in your successor?

[Morgun] First of all he should be well versed in ecology so that he can get to work immediately. I should like him to have courage, persistence, and the character of a fighter. He cannot get by without these qualities. This person must feel with his mind and heart the interests of the people and not sacrifice them to benefit the department. I would like him not to fall into confusion in the face of incredibly difficult, complicated, and frequently contradictory problems. Since the committee was created recently and everything having to do with the protection of nature is at the level of conversations and discussions, my successor will inevitably have to learn in this post. This means that he should have a good number of years of work behind him; he should be 15-20 years younger than I.

[Peskov] It was said at the recent Congress of People's Deputies that the newly created committee does not have the proper status, that it has become a regular department. People's Deputy Yablokov said that we were not expecting that kind of committee. What comments do you have about this viewpoint?

[Morgun] I fully agree with it. The problem of the new committee is that at the large table of our authority it can only have a special viewpoint which they may or may not take into account. Time has shown that most frequently they do not. Decisions are made taking into account the opinions of the majority of representatives of the departments. But the committee is forced to update only its own particular viewpoint. It is not difficult to understand that with such a state of affairs with the protection of nature things will proceed just as they have in the past. I think it is wrong that the committee is constantly being given instructions to solve problems which should be solved by other departments and ministries. In many cities of Bashkiria, for example, a very unfavorable ecological situation has developed. Industrial ministries are to blame for this, but documents with instructions to put things in order are given to the Goskompriroda. Somebody starts a fire and the committee must put it out, while its role is to insure the observance of laws for the protection of nature, to monitor and order others to put out fires and also inform the government of this. I support the viewpoint that the chairman of Goskompriroda should be a deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers or be a part of the USSR Supreme Soviet as, for example, the chairman of the People's Control Committee is. If we recognize that ecological problems are the most important ones for us, we must improve the status of the Goskompriroda. I am convinced that sooner or later this will have to happen.

[Peskov] Fedor Trofimovich, I have known you for a long time and I cannot imagine you keeping bees or raising strawberries. What kind of life are you going to have?

[Morgun] I am thinking about that now. I must admit that at times I think about an apiary or a strawberry garden. But it does not work, my worries will not leave me alone. I still have strength and I must use it to benefit people. The struggle to preserve the fertility of the soil is my life's work. I shall fight for my position. Moreover, like many of my contemporaries, I have a hard and interesting life and meetings with brilliant people behind me. I hope that I will be able to interpret all this and write about it. I will not languish with nothing to do.

[Peskov] Well, as they say, whatever you do it is for the better. Allow me to express to you my unwavering love and respect. I hope that we shall meet again.

[Morgun] I thank you and your newspaper for the opportunity to speak my piece at this time of life which is difficult for me.

Conference Discusses Nuclear Test Concerns

PM0808143589 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 89 p 1

[Special correspondents V. Grechanin and L. Reznikov report: "Test Site Reveals Secrets"]

[Text] A scientific and practical conference that has ended in the city of Irtysh summed up the results of the work of an interdepartmental commission to thoroughly investigate the environmental situation and the state of the population's health in Semipalatinsk Oblast.

A great many unresolved problems have piled up during the long existence of the nuclear test site near Semipalatinsk in conditions of total secrecy and they were all at the center of attention for scientists from Moscow, Alma-Ata, and the country's other cities along with representatives of the public. Their prime subject was improving the work of the pediatric service to reduce infant and child mortality figures.

In the opinion of the participants in the conference, the thorough investigation of the health of the inhabitants of the rural areas adjacent to the test site and the oblast center initiated by the commission must be continued. These checks must encompass population centers not only in Semipalatinsk Oblast but also in neighboring oblasts and Altay Kray. With this in view steps must be taken to considerably reinforce the health service's material base, especially in rural areas.

Considering the ever increasing concern of local inhabitants and their psychological state, which has been brought about by the presence of a nuclear test site in the oblast, the participants in the conference unanimously recommended the radical step of stopping the tests here.

V.P. Strekhnin, senior official at the CPSU Central Committee, and Ye.M. Asanbayev, deputy chairman of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, spoke at the conference.

(A detailed report of the conference's work will be published in one of the next editions of KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA).

Nevada-Semipalatinsk Group's Statement Released

LD0808184489 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS—Participants in the Nevada- Semipalatinsk anti-nuclear public movement have called Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush to sign a treaty on a mutual moratorium on underground nuclear weapon tests. The text of the appeal by the movement of the residents of Kazakhstan, where the Soviet nuclear test range is located, released here today, says that "The last page of the history of nuclear confrontation should be turned as early as now and the first chapter begun in the history of peace—the chapter of trust".

Participants in the movement also adopted an appeal to the peoples of the world, the governments of the countries, politicians and public organisations. "The nuclear defence shield is being turned into a mortal danger to mankind. This is especially evident now that we shed political prejudices and come to an awareness that no ideas, even the brightest ones, can be more important than man," the appeal points out. "Proceeding from this bitterly apprehended truth, we urge our government and the governments of other countries to reach an agreement on a complete nuclear test ban in all countries".

The issue of halting nuclear testing was also raised in the appeal by the USSR Supreme Soviet to the U.S. Congress, which was adopted last week. The Soviet parliament stated for one more time about the USSR's readiness to announce any day and hour, on the basis of reciprocity, a moratorium on all nuclear blasts. Such a moratorium could be a prologue to the conclusion of an agreement on a verifiable comprehensive nuclear test ban. The Supreme Soviet proposed to discuss this issue at a meeting of the two countries' parliamentarians in Moscow or Washington.

Semipalatinsk Resident on Health Problems

LD1607162689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1120 GMT 16 JUL 89

[From the "View" program]

[Excerpts] [Presenter] Very often when we read the newspapers many people probably notice the TASS reports on the back page saying that an explosion of such-and-such a strength has been carried out at the test site near Semipalatinsk—without, to be honest, paying much attention to them. Well, on the one hand, Semipalatinsk is a long way away—a city that has nothing to do with us. But I have been wondering how the people who actually live in that city, 120 kilometers from the test site, feel about it. And when we in Moscow were contacted by the chairman of the Semipalatinsk Oblast Peace Committee, Dr (Mayra Zhangelova), I naturally made a point of asking her about this. How do the people of Semipalatinsk feel every time they read about these blasts?

[(Zhangelova)] My dear Vladislav, to us original inhabitants of Semipalatinsk Oblast, every stone, every grain of sand, and every drop of pure water from our own soil is precious. You know of course that Semipalatinsk Oblast is the cultural and educational center of the [Kazakh] Republic. Ours is an international region where very industrious, selfless, and good people live and work. Our land has given humanity such talented people as Abay [Kunanbayev, Kazakh poet], Shekerim,

and (?Mukhtar-Uezova). You know that for 40 years now, nuuclear weapons tests have been carried out in our oblast. For the first 15 years—1949 to 1963—those nuclear-weapon tests were carried out in the open, in the atmosphere.

[Presenter] Excuse me, presumably some of that must have been carried over the town when the wind was blowing in a certain direction.

[(Zhangelova)] The incidence of disease among inhabitants has increased considerably in recent years, especially in the last few decades. We have a lot of blood diseases, a lot of cancer. The number of children with congenital diseases and mental and physical defects is increasing. Our oblast has the country's highest infant and maternal mortality rate. [passage omitted] Oblast medical workers were recruited to work with that team. We got a lot of help from the scientists of Alma-Ata. The members of the commission worked for 3 weeks, very conscientiously and very productively. The medical people on that commission particularly noted that the incidence of disease in the oblast was directly proportional to the length of time, the duration of residence in the oblast, and to closeness to the test site. The preliminary data from the medical investigation showed a substantial worsening of the health of the population, with all indices of cellular immunity lower than normal: there are considerable blood changes, in the direction of leukopenia. The medical people and the scientists have many times sent open letters, appeals, and requests for mass screening of the oblast inhabitants.

[Presenter] To where were those sent?

[(Zhangelova)] They were addressed first to our own oblast leadership, to the scientists of our country, and to the USSR Ministry of Health.

[Presenter] Now tell me, if for instance you had a house of your own, and your neighbor was exploding something in his backyard every day, or every other day, causing poisonous smoke to constantly come over to your side, into your house as it were: What would you personally do in such a situation.

[(Zhangelova)] [coughs and hesitates] I...

[Presenter, interrupting] Would you take your neighbor to court for disturbing your peace?

[(Zhangelova)] I would like to remind you of a splendid thing that was said by Abay Kunanbayev: The essence of the human being is love, warmth, and justice. Human beings cannot live without those elements.

[Presenter] Do you intend to fight somehow against the test site?

[(Zhangelova)] I consider it my professional duty and my duty as a citizen to demand today the immediate cessation of tests in Semipalatinsk Oblast, because nowhere in the world has the testing of nuclear weapons been carried on so actively in one place.

Ecological Impact of Nuclear Test Site Examined

PM2007083989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jul 89 First Edition p 2

[Correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Ladin report: "Conference in Semipalatinsk"]

[Text] Semipalatinsk—A scientific and practical conference on "The Population's Health and the Ecological Situation in Semipalatinsk Oblast" began work in the Political Enlightenment House here yesterday, 17 July. It is organized jointly by the USSR and republican Ministries of Health and the Semipalatinsk party oblast committee [obkom] and oblast soviet executive committee.

The conference participants will hear reports by scientists who conducted a comprehensive study of local residents, analyzed soil, air, and water samples, and evaluated data on the seismological condition of the earth's crust. The conference's work program includes speeches by leading specialists from the USSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Ministry of Health, and representatives of party and soviet organs and the public.

G. Mishchenko, secretary of Semipalatinsk Kazakh Communist Party Obkom, said in an interview for our newspaper that the scientific and practical conference is called upon to introduce clarity into current views regarding the consequences of nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk test site and to elaborate proposals to limit their effects on the ecology and people's health.

The conference is attended by delegations from Pavlodar, Karaganda, East Kazakhstan, and Aktyubinsk Oblasts and Altay Kray. TASS, television, and the central and local press are represented.

Causes, Consequences of 1957 Kyshtym Disaster

18010839 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jul 89 First Edition p 6

[Article by A. Illesh: "Thirty Years Before Chernobyl"]

[Text]**At the invitation of the USSR Nuclear Society (whose creation was reported in IZVESTIYA No 41 and No 109 of this year), a delegation of the American Atomic Association, an influential, nongovernmental organization came to Moscow. Our colleagues had planned more than a few meetings with specialists and the public. Our correspondent was at one of them at the Kurchatov Atomic Energy Institute [IAE]. In acquainting the Americans with the situation which came about in the Soviet atomic**

energy industry after Chernobyl, Academician N. Ponomarev-Stepnoy, first deputy director of this enormous institute (approximately 20,000 associates work at the three IAE sites) shared, in particular, information which had until quite recently been considered completely secret, protected with special stamps in special departments. One of the pieces discussing the the Soviet public society of atomic workers was entitled "The Nuclear Society Is Open to Opponents." As the meeting of Soviet and U.S. specialists showed, this society is prepared to share not only the successes, but also to honestly discuss the terrible pages of the formation of the industry, which made wide use of the not quite peaceful atom....

So what exactly happened in the Southern Urals on 29 September 1957?

We speak of the defense enterprise which was built near the city of Kyshtym immediately after the war for the creation of something principally new—atomic weaponry. Understandably, in the early years of work of the enterprise, the personnel of this branch had no experience. Hence, mistakes. But that was not all: Also lacking was a serious scientific study of the issues of preserving health and, moreover, the environment. In brief, such is today's explanation of the first steps taken in this tragedy long ago.

The beginning. Here, at first, an enormous volume of water contaminated with a high level of radioactivity flowed into the Techa River without any purification! After some time, it became apparent that the radiation was being spread for many kilometers. Then a new (but by today's standards, hardly more sensible) solution was adopted: The wastes went into Karachay Lake, which has no outlet. Soon the lake also became overfilled with radioactivity, and it became dangerous to be on its shores.

The third solution of the problem of getting rid of "unnecessary wastes" was already one of engineering. But, alas, only to a certain extent. The wastes (up to 2 million curies) were poured into a concrete reservoir and buried. Apparently they did not think too long about observing precise dosage levels or other precautions extremely important in such situations. Nor did they consider the possibility of some sort of reaction, either chemical or physical, arising in the sealed reservoirs.... The country required defense production, and it was turned out.

From the information prepared by the group of physicists, radiologists, and other specialists:

"As a result of the malfunction of the cooling system, an explosion (thermal) occurred in the concrete reservoir with highly radioactive nitroacetate wastes, leading to the discharge of radioactive fission products in the atmosphere with their subsequent dispersion and deposition on parts of the territory of Chelyabinsk, Sverdlovsk, and Tyumen Oblasts. The discharge comprised approximately 2.1 million curies." (During the accident at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station], 50 million were discharged. Incidentally, there are no highly radioactive wastes at the AES which require special cooling, and the fuel is specially preserved).

And this radioactive trail crept over some 100 km, at a breadth of about 10 km. Specialists cite another figure as well—the contaminated zone (calculated by strontium-90 fallout) was over 15,000 square kilometers, and approximately 270,000 people lived in this territory. Over 10,000 people were resettled from the regions extremely dangerous for life encompassed in this zone. (With the accident at the Chernobyl AES, 116,000 were evacuated). The period of the initiation of the evacuation extended from a week to a year and a half.

How were the land, fields, and meadows here restored? Agricultural lands were replowed. Over the course of 2 years (1958-1959), 20,000 hectares in front of the trail were subject to normal plowing. Deep plowing was done in a 6,200 hectare area in 1961-1962... A program of limited utilization of contaminated territory was introduced in only the most dangerous areas immediately after the accident. Later a sanitary-defense zone was established in the entire contaminated territory.

In Chelyabinsk and Sverdlovsk Oblasts, the gradual inclusion of the lands in agricultural use was begun. Nine specialized sovkhozes [state farms] were created in the damaged territory mainly to produce meat, a product with a minimum strontium-90 content, compared with others. Scientists developed recommendations for the local areas' output of agricultural products. Alas, this advice was little known to those who were growing produce in their private plots.

While the radioactive hygiene and the ecological situation were being studied among the local population, specialized public health brigades were conducting curative-prevention and, as the information asserts, educational work. Other measures were also taken to reduce entry of radionuclides into people's organisms. But today, the specialists acknowledge that the measures taken at the time were ineffective. The thing is that because of the peculiarities of the landscape, the decontamination of the territory was of little use.

And how did medicine monitor the population? The radioactive contaminated zone was cordoned off, and those living there were (in stages) moved to other, cleaner places. People were monitored; the parameters of their physical condition and blood production were recorded. Neurological status was investigated; child and infant development were monitored; infant mortality was recorded. Research was conducted annually during the first 3 years after the accident; later, once every 10 years. It continues even now.

And one of the sorest points since Chernobyl is: What about radiation sickness? Are there data on genetic changes among the Ural dwellers? I cite the documents again:

"Radiation sickness, all forms, negative. Depression of bone marrow function, negative. Quantitative reduction of blood platelets, individual cases. Functional-neurological disturbances, individual cases. Allergic reactions, negative...."

Specialists maintain that even against the background of the infant mortality rate existing in those years, there was no manifestation within this index of any aggravating effect of elevated radiation. We are all anxious over the extreme possibility of the appearance of anomalies in the progeny of irradiated parents. The investigation of this index of not only the first, but the second generation of individuals exposed to radiation allows public health personnel to assert that everything is fairly satisfactory here, too.

And finally, cancer. The chart of mortality rates from malignant tumors corroborates that no differences in mortality dependent upon people's place of residence are manifest. And with time, the frequency of cancer death is nevertheless increasing, both throughout the world and in the USSR, as well as, in particular, in the territory of the radioactive trail. What is the matter here? Public health officials maintain that this is conditioned by the general processes of the deterioration of the world's ecological condition.

...It would be very difficult to simply take today's interpretation of such old facts at face value. But it must be done. For, in the meantime, we have no other data or explanations of what happened on 29 September 1957. But I am convinced that it is impossible to simply forget about what occurred, whatever it was, no matter how soothingly the specialists talk about it today, however satisfactory, from the radiological point of view, the situation in the Southern Urals appears. Of course, it is difficult to compare modern, technologically complex production, all the more so, the atomic energy industry, with the secret plants and factories hastily erected during the first escalation of the nuclear arms race. But in order to be certain not only of today, but of our tomorrow, strict public control must be imposed over all production potentially harmful to health.

Nuclear Waste Burial in Krasnoyarsk Opposed

18220176 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 23 Jul 89 p 4

[S. Bykov report: "Checking for Stability"]

[Text] Krasnoyarsk—Way above our heads, separated from us by dozens of meters of rock, the waters of the Yenisey flow past. A chill runs through the skin as you think...what if....

"The tunnel is a really good one," the chief engineer of the project, Yu. Chekmarev, assures us. "Construction of the pipeline beneath the river was one of our most difficult tasks. And we coped with it."

The green "Uazik" car strains as it rumbles upward through the tunnel. Two long rows of dim lamps run off behind along the ceiling, while water trickles down the damp concrete walls in streams. At the very deepest mark, which we have just passed, a drilling installations whines: holes are being drilled in the wall so that mortar can be poured in and route of the substratum water in the tunnel blocked off. Almost all other work at the project known as "site No 27" has been halted.

This "site" is nothing other than an enterprise to process waste from nuclear power stations. The decision to set up this kind of production facility in Krasnoyarsk Kray was reached back in the 1970's. The development of power engineering is inconceivable without nuclear power stations. Hence it is also necessary to think about how to deal with the far from safe "slag" from the nuclear "stokehold." Science has not come up with a better method than that of burying the waste in deep geological formations. The difference is found in the details: some countries prefer to bury waste in solid form, while in others they pump liquid solutions into the bowels of the earth.

In Krasnoyarsk Kray they chose the second variant. Not far from the Yenisey, at a depth of 600 to 700 meters the geologists found what they believe is a closed lens—a water-saturated arenaceous stratum with all sides surrounded by clays. It was proposed to pump into it under pressure, toxic industrial effluent from enterprises that process waste.

Naturally, in those years few people knew what the gigantic structure being raised near a city of one million inhabitants was: for more than 10 years it was shrouded in secrecy. Vague rumors about some kind of "burial ground" on the outskirts of the city alarmed the people of Krasnoyarsk. And early this year, during the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, this alarm was made tangible by an inquiry to the deputies from writers Viktor Astafyev and Roman Solntsev.

The inquiry was like an exploding bomb. The letters poured into the party and soviet offices, the editorial offices of the newspapers, radio and television. Thousands of signatures to protests were collected at enterprises and establishments and simply on the streets of Krasnoyarsk.

As the designers themselves now admit, they overlooked the opportunity to prevent this explosion of indignation because they failed to provide complete and exhaustive information about the construction. And now they are having to assume a defensive stance, somehow trying to break a public opinion that has already been formed.

At the insistence of the people of Krasnoyarsk the kray executive committee has set up a special commission to study the problem. It includes scientists from the Siberian Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences, representatives of the public, designers and producers, and journalists. For two or three months, and longer if need be, the commission is to examine all aspects of the construction and arrive at a conclusions about whether or not it should be continued.

Its work is being made even more complicated by the fact that not all information is accessible. But the former Ministry of Medium Machine Building, and now the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power, is promising an immediate decision on the question of releasing all the data.

Meanwhile it is necessary to study the geologists' conclusions—how careful they were in selecting the burial site—and the construction workers—did they do their job in a good-quality manner? USSR people's deputies and journalists were given an opportunity to familiarize themselves with a production facility already in operation, processing fuel waste from nuclear power stations. There are no doubts about the skills of personnel at that plant, or about the well-developed nature of the technology. But today we have learned through the bitter experience of the Chernobyl tragedy to approach with a natural mistrust even the firmest assurances of the absolute safety of any particular "hot" project.

In order to convince itself of the trustworthiness of these assurances the commission also held one of its meetings right there in "site No 27." To the question of whether or not there was any analogue anywhere in the world of this installation—almost 20 kilometers of pipeline from the enterprise directly to the burial site—the designers responded in the negative. In addition, nowhere on earth do such pipelines cross large rivers along their routes. And here we have the Yenisey! So it is that tens of thousands of people and an enormous territory become hostages to the dreadful waste.... How many times is it necessary to take the measurements to be sure they are right?

The commission has a great deal to study. Geological, geophysical, geochemical, biophysical and ecological problems—by no means a complete list of what the scientists must now study at many research institutes. Neither can people's alarm be ignored. The rumors that are circulating in the Krasnoyarsk area! That there are already several such "burial grounds" on its territory, and that a nuclear reactor is in operation near Krasnoyarsk, and that small accidents have occurred there. The reps of the department are unable to provide the answers: it is secret! This means that we can expect new outbursts of indignation. And in an ecological situation that has long been unfavorable, that indignation may assume the most unforeseen kinds of forms. This should be remembered.

The "Uazik" comes out suddenly into the scorching July sun. The more than 2.5 kilometers underground are behind us. The tunnel really has been made well, it must be admitted. How well the other technical refinements have been thought out remains to be seen.

Consolidation of Ideological Bodies Urged

18001386 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Jul 89 First Edition p 2

[Article by V. Demchenko, chief of the House of Political Education of the Kamchatka CPSU Obkom: "From Above to Below"]

[Text] *I see that concern about the position and role of the CPSU in the society is understood in different ways by workers of the party apparatus. Some see their duty as accepting the need for perestroyka in words and energetically, with noble indignation, note any unflattering responses about committee cadres. This is frequently not their fault but their misfortune: They live in a different era. Others think about what they should do in order to restore their lost respect—and they encounter suspicion from many of their present and former colleagues: They wonder if it is really necessary to air their dirty laundry...*

My article in the oblast newspaper devoted to the shortcomings of the work of the apparatus evoked clear disapproval from some of my comrades. But nonetheless conditions in society relating to this issue have become too acute to remain silent about something that is being discussed actively in the labor collectives, is making a splash in pre-election meetings and gatherings, and then is discussed from the podium of the Congress of People's Deputies. No, I will not accept the view of the party apparatus as the one responsible for all of our problems. But it does need improvement—this is a fact that cannot be ignored.

As time goes by, "areas beyond criticism" are becoming more and more unacceptable. It is known that according to the CPSU regulations a Communist has a right to criticize any party level and any worker. I am convinced that the time will come when this will be the norm. It is already coming. Suffice it to recall the recent April plenum of the Central Committee. And articles in PRAVDA analyzing the work of the party obkom [oblast committee] are pointed and open not "according to status" but in human terms: Arm us against the tempting "hotheads" and in some places even against openly spiteful people.

But I do not recall a case in which someone not in general party documents but on the pages of a central organ began to speak, as was the case in Lenin's time, about certain blunders in the activity of the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee. It is not pleasant, it is fraught with an undermining of authority, and it is dangerous—anyone who initiates a conversation on this topic would

probably receive many warnings like this. In any case I have heard them. But the problem is that even if we open our eyes to these problems they do not disappear.

The restructuring of the party apparatus has started. It would seem that with respect to its central unit there was no need for any hurry—the time periods were established not from the outside but, as it were, in their own home. And what was the result?

I shall not undertake to judge specifically more than one section of the work. For 9 years I have been directly engaged in the organization and methodology of political education. And it would be all right if the obvious gaps existed only in it; then in principle, I hope, it would not be difficult to rectify the situation. But from my comrades who are party workers I know that there is justification for criticism of other structures as well. This means that to postpone an open exchange of opinions regarding this is to the detriment of the general party cause. It is necessary to speak openly regardless of where they may be, from above to below. They must be discussed in order to eliminate them as quickly as possible.

And so, about our section. I do not think that even a very well intentioned person will understand the need for a kind of "diarchy" in the leadership of political training: On the one hand, the Ideological Department of the Central Committee has the corresponding sector and, on the other, several years ago we created the All-Union House of Political Education under the CPSU Central Committee. There are three people working in the former and about two dozen in the latter. This means that the former are providing ideological leadership as distinct from the latter, who are responsible for methodological support for training. Thus the attempts to influence the restructuring Marxist-Leninist education so far cannot be called constructive.

This was elucidated once again in April at the regional scientific and technical conference in Yakutsk. Reports were given by the leaders of both subdivisions and it was obvious to each participant how artificial it was to divide this group into the parts for the organization and the methods of training. And sector chief V.A. Saprykin behaved (as, incidentally, he always does) with a barely concealed superiority, emphasizing the distance marked by belonging equally to the collectives he headed—the "Central Committee" and "under the Central Committee."

This is not a disturbing episode. A similar distancing is exhibited in daily life. In order to solve some practical problem the secretary or chief of a department of a lower party committee must telephone the sector in the Central Committee, and for advice about forms and means of training leaders of the local house of political education must ask the all-union house of political education. This was apparently dictated by the need to specialize and to increase responsibility for specific work. Nonetheless in practice the inevitable duplication and parallelism have become an impediment today.

It seems that it would be correct to concentrate all functions in one unit. In my opinion, it would be more expedient to do this by reducing the size of the sector. In turn, the transformation of the All-Union House of Political Education under the CPSU Central Committee into a sociopolitical center (with its magazine POLITICHESKOYE OBRAZOVANIYE and movie and video association with the corresponding subject matter) would correspond more to the new ideological situation in the country.

The need for reorganization is especially appreciable in the local areas. During the course of the restructuring of Marxist-Leninist education our house of political education is increasingly assuming a generally accessible cultural and political nature. There have been essential changes in the forms and methods of the work of the institutions located here—the house itself in which representatives of labor collectives of all population points on the peninsula study; the evening university of Marxism-Leninism which has more than 700 students; the training and consultation point of the Khabarovsk higher party school, 80 percent of whose students are representatives of production collectives, mainly naval collectives; and the courses for increasing the qualifications of party and soviet workers in which a considerable number of the workers and employees who combine their basic labor activity with social work study each year.

In recent years the house has been simplifying its ties with the rank-and-file representatives of various social groups. Working in it are the university of culture, a permanent movie theater, a video room, a youth discussion club, meetings are always being held with interesting people in the country and leaders of the oblast and city with the local population, conferences on specific subjects, and an exhibit entitled "Kamchatka Under the 12th 5-Year Plan" has opened up. Among the services for city residents are an information-methodological center and group and individual consultations on sociopolitical literature. With our participation measures are being conducted with the Znaniye Society, the fight for sobriety, the Peace Fund, the veterans' council, and the Memorial Association. Labor collectives of the oblast center frequently rent premises. We try to help them with the content of the training process in the political schools and seminars with videotapes, mainly on important sociopolitical events. This part of our daily concerns could be expanded and filled with new content if we were to follow in the footsteps of the all-union house and become an independent party institution with the rights of a corporate body.

Here is just one example of the possibilities that are opening up here. Today the house of political education has a uniquely complete videotape of the 19th All-Union

CPSU Conference, and there is a great deal of interest in it as usual. It is as though the people are measuring today's practice against the conclusions and opinions of the general party forum. Many labor collectives are requesting this tape. Those who because of their work are far from their native shores have a special need for it. We have many thousands of people like that—fishermen and sailors. And it is not easy to help them. We do not have enough blank cassettes. It would be possible to obtain them locally without any special difficulty, but...we have our own running account.

With the system that exists today, the main say in solving ideological problems, paradoxical as it may be, sometimes goes to the affairs administration. It decides when and at what time to do repair work (it will soon be a year since our large hall has been repaired, and it is one of the few large ones in the oblast center), what technical training equipment to deliver, and so forth.

It seems clear that this situation must be changed. Many of my colleagues from other regions of the country are also convinced of this. I tried to gain support for this from the section chief of the department of the CPSU Central Committee, V.A. Saprykin, but I found not simply a lack of understanding but an edifying reproach: You are not reading the documents of the Central Committee—they have long been calling upon you to transform the houses of political education into centers for political work in local areas. So I do not know what there is more of here—a lack of understanding of what it taking place in the local areas or the habit of carrying out only his own instructions. But when the communications go only one way, from above to below, and they do not listen to what we down below have to say, this is bad for the cause.

The sector of the department of the CPSU Central Committee and the All-Union House of Political Education will look for a practical solution to personnel problems in ideology on a principally different level from today. What do I have in mind?

When the educational level of our society and of the party itself was appreciably lower it was necessary to solve problems of the distribution of workers on the basis of the staff list. Today the situation has changed strikingly but the approach to this initially important matter has not changed. I think the party has matured to the point where it can solve problems of placement of workers of its apparatus on the basis of open competition. This is especially promising with respect to the ideological sphere: On the basis of recommendations from the local party units, testing, and competition in public statements, including oral, it is possible to select the strongest workers. The participation of labor collectives in this would create the understanding and support we need so much in places where above all the tension in the sociopolitical network is measured as though it were in energy engineering.

Sverdlovsk Oblast Electoral Defeats Analyzed

18001377 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jul 89 First Edition p 2

[Article by PRAVDA special correspondent V. Kozhemyako: "Authoritarianism or Authority?"]

[Text] If we were to try to distinguish the main feature of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, which at present is very much on the minds of us all, this would probably be the defeat of authoritarianism and the affirmation of genuine authority. Let us recall that it was the authority of personality bolstered by bright, nonstandard thoughts voiced from the speaker's stand that most frequently brought success to the deputies. As a rule, it was authority that gained the support of the majority during voting. All kinds of attempts "to bring pressure to bear" by the old, command-administrative methods usually ended in failure.

When one analyzes this, he arrives at the conclusion that much of what came to the fore during the congress is rooted in a period as early as that of elections of the people's deputies. Much time has passed since, and a lot has been written and said about the elections. However, the interest in this referendum is not declining. Perhaps it would be worthwhile to address many more times the lessons of the elections which, as was noted at the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum, provide much food for thought. After all, the election campaign for republic and local soviets is not that far away. Therefore, the lessons in question have quite a practical aspect. What are the lessons in Sverdlovsk Oblast, one of our largest?

Let us begin with the fact that here, as well as in other localities, the results turned out to be absolutely unpredictable on many occasions, and, in terms of the old notions, even shocking, unlike the old times. What used to be the case? You do remember well: All those nominated candidates were doomed to success ahead of time. This time, only in one electoral okrug out of the 14 created in the oblast a candidate ran unopposed. Therefore, it was altogether impossible to guess at the outcome of the contest ahead of time.

Putting it mildly, the outcome indeed turned out not to be conventional. Let us look at, say, the following fact: Two key leaders of the oblast—First Secretary of the party obkom [oblast committee] L. Bobykin and Chairman of the Ispolkom [soviet executive committee] V. Vlasov—were not elected deputies. Both of them failed to capture even a quarter of the vote. In the process, one of them lost to a young party raykom [rayon committee] secretary, not even the first secretary, while the other to a rank-and-file engineer from a plant. One begins to think willy-nilly: Could it be that in essence the engineer is not rank-and-file at all?

Similar questions arise. For example, has it ever happened before that a deputy director (not even the director!) of a branch professional improvement institute

became a deputy somewhere? Now one has—G. Burbulis from the Mintsvetmet [Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy] institute in Sverdlovsk. When you begin to analyze the reasons you come to understand that this is not a matter of chance at all. We are looking not at a common man at all but at an outstanding personality. He has been known for almost 2 years now to the entire city as a talented, bold, and erudite host of the "Discussion Tribune." My interlocutors stated in unison: This is what the numerous votes of the constituents are due to.

This is the main point: The man has genuine rather than formal authority. Nobody has assigned his authority to him from "on high": He has gained the confidence of a majority of the citizens of Sverdlovsk himself, through his vigorous social activities. This is why they made him a deputy.

I have said: The authority was not assigned from on high. Let us think, however: Could the authority be indeed given in that manner? We remember the time when it was believed that yes, it could, by an appointment to a position, by an authoritarian directive drafted within a narrow circle. However, was it not a delusion of sorts for the narrow circle? After all, it was also believed over there, at the top, that the authority is delegated on down together with the position. Down below, these people were not necessarily respected. As I see it, by now it is clear to all that it is not the illusory authority of the position but the genuine authority of personality that enjoys real influence. The turnaround of our times consists of the fact that the authoritarian methods of asserting power, when its representatives were essentially imposed rather than elected, are being replaced by democratic methods. This is exactly why we encounter on the list of deputies a rank-and-file engineer, a third raykom secretary, and a deputy director of the branch institute who, as you would agree, would have never gotten there previously.

Indeed, authority is a priority! As far as authority goes, you either have it or you do not. One cannot be appointed a person with authority.

Now let us try to understand why the first secretary of the party obkom did not become a deputy. A biographical poster published during the period of preparations for the election says about Leonid Fedorovich Bobykin: "From his childhood years on, he has dreamt about creating sophisticated machines. After graduating from the Urals Polytechnical Institute he came to the Uralmashzavod [Urals Machinebuilding Plant]. He subsequently became involved in Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Youth Communist League] and party work, headed a rayon and Sverdlovsk city party organizations, was elected secretary and second secretary of the CPSU obkom."

So, this is a quite worthy and, as they say, smooth biography. However, do the constituents now attach dominant significance to the biographical appointment data of the candidate? Don't they judge him rather on the basis of personality traits and specific accomplishments?

However, there is a feature in the biography of L. Bobykin which, in the unanimous opinion of all those to whom I have talked, cannot be passed over quietly by any voter. As participants in the pre-election meetings testify, this feature consistently caused sharp, and at times ill-disposed, questions to the candidate. The point is that in 1983 he was initially deputy head and, subsequently, head of the Department of Light Industry and Consumer Goods of the CPSU Central Committee. It is common knowledge what the situation with these goods has been in our country. Though the head of the department is not the only person at fault in this matter, it was also impossible to entirely distance himself from the situation which has emerged. After all, being held responsible for the light industry is anything but easy!

Leonid Fedorovich became first secretary of the party obkom in June of last year; that is to say, recently. Regardless of this, he was held accountable for everything. Such is the fate of the "first secretary"—he is held responsible for everything. When I leafed through hundreds of notes that the candidate had received in the course of pre-election meetings I read:

"Is our oblast capable of supplying itself with foodstuffs?"

"Where have such necessities as laundry and bath soap, detergents, and tea gone from the shelves of stores?"

"How are we to explain to our children that there is no candy, that sugar rations are 1.5 kilograms—this is very little—when will this ration card rule go away? So, tea has disappeared again. As far as sausage, it goes... for 8 to 10 rubles."

"Why don't kolkhoz [collective farm] members have the same rights as everyone else in the issue of retirement benefits?"

"How do you understand fighting alcoholism at the present stage?"

"Why are the prices for industrial goods and foodstuffs growing uncontrollably in our oblast and the country as a whole? Fresh cucumbers have come to cost 6 rubles! This speculation proceeds in broad daylight."

It is understandable that it is not enough to explain these issues; they have got to be resolved. When we talked about this to Leonid Fedorovich, he emphasized economic accountability and self-financing, to which, in his opinion, the oblast should switch as soon as possible.

Indeed, what is the case at present? One of the most industrially developed oblasts of the country, which is the second in the Russian Federation in the volume of

industrial production, at the same time ranks 36th in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] in the availability of residential floor space per capita, 27th in the availability of hospital beds, 32d in the availability of retail space, 68th in the availability of theater seats, 50th in the availability of phones in the city, and 56th in rural areas... And so on, and so forth...

Need we comment that this is entirely abnormal? Certainly, much work is in store, and the obkom first secretary alone will not handle it overnight even if he were to be 10 feet tall. Perhaps, some voters understand this soberly; others do not want to take into account any objective conditions. However, other things need to be considered too: Apart from the difficulties which have emerged objectively by now, there are problems of, so to speak, a subjective nature which also influence public opinion to a great degree whether one likes it or not.

First of all, the people talked about whether the first secretary of the obkom was close to them or not. Yes, when the pre-election meetings began, he traveled and made speeches sparing no effort. What about the time before this? Few people had seen and heard him. Almost all citizens of Sverdlovsk and of the oblast recognize the face of G. Burbulis, who was mentioned above. Meetings of the city "Discussion Tribune" do not only attract a multitude of people, but are extensively broadcast on the local TV channel. The first secretary, in his turn, appeared on TV only twice during the entire period, and in conjunction with the explosion at the Sverdlovsk shunting yard station he appeared with an obvious delay of almost 1 month. They have been inviting him in vain to a meeting with college students and instructors for several months now: He cannot make time...

There is no questioning the fact that the first secretary of the obkom is a very busy person. However, let us put it bluntly. In organizing his work time, he should definitely figure in the need for continuous communication with the people. Otherwise, a contemporary politician cannot hope at all to be successful.

Politics is impossible without taking public opinion into account thoroughly, without predicting how a misdeed (even one!) of the leader will be reflected in it. It is characteristic that for L. Bobykin the note about B. Yeltsin to the presidium of the 19th All-Union Party Conference became, one might say, fatal. He sent it on behalf of the entire Sverdlovsk delegation, though, as it came out, not all of the people on it agreed with the note. A short speech at the conference by V. Volkov, party committee secretary at the M.I. Kalinin Machinebuilding Plant, which sounded discordant compared to many others, was as decisive for him. At present, the readers of PRAVDA are asking: What has happened to him, how does he live and work, has he been subjected to persecution? For example, A. Korovin from Novosibirsk, member of the CPSU since 1943, comes right to the point: "There are rumors that he does not work as the party committee secretary anymore."

He does! Moreover, he has been nominated and elected USSR people's deputy, having defeated in what they call a major way even a competitor as outstanding as General Director of the "Uralmash" Association I. Stroganov. Perhaps this does not agree with some people. Perhaps, some would like to remove him from the position of the raykom secretary as well. It could be that in another time this would have been the case. However... this is an entirely different time. In situations of this kind, it is not authoritarianism that holds sway but, as we have already said, real authority.

At present, the need for a comprehensive and profound analysis of the lessons of the election campaign is acutely felt everywhere, including Sverdlovsk Oblast. The city committee of the party in the oblast center held a plenum devoted to this issue; the person making the report, Secretary of the City Committee A. Barmashov contributed a special article to VECHERNIY SVERDLOVSK. In his turn, the obkom secretary for ideology, V. Andrianov, who contributed an article on the tasks of the campaign in the oblast newspaper URALSKIY RABOCHIY, initially did not want to summarize its results in the newspaper, as the editor said. Supposedly, what was there to summarize, if they were so grim? However, the voters of the oblast have given an overwhelming majority of their votes to communists; there are only two nonparty members among the deputies. That is, the results are not unambiguous at all...

Rebukes addressed to the mass media were heard at the expanded meeting of the party obkom buro. This is how it went on record: They have made a number of mistakes. Well, there may be certain grounds for this assertion. However, it would be worthwhile to sort out more specifically and objectively what is to be considered a mistake and what is not. For example, can one unload his wrath on the oblast newspaper for publishing the letter by the voter R. Lapshina, which referred to the uneven conditions for pre-election struggle in the Kamyshlov Electoral Okrug, where the first secretary of the party obkom and the raykom secretary, A. Izmodenov, ran? The letter read: "Judge for yourselves: When Izmodenov came here nobody even met him... However, before the visit of his rival an alarm was raised for literally everyone. The speech of the latter was broadcast on the local radio, while Andrey Konstantinovich was deprived of this opportunity."

At present, people react sharply to such inequality in rights. Most frequently, it causes the opinions and actions opposite to the ones planned by the organizers. Active opposition is the result. Is this not what Gennadiy Fedorovich Dudkin from the city of Bogdanovich (the Kamyshlov Electoral Okrug once again) writes to PRAVDA about:

"Over here the crudest ways and methods were used in the course of the election campaign. At the meetings of propagandists all propaganda was in favor of only the first secretary of the obkom and against the second

candidate; on the radio the same was the case. At the session of the city soviet it was said: Vote only for L. Bobykin, and it was said by the first secretary of the party gorkom. In the city newspaper there was an article so 'subservient' that it caused a sharp denunciation by all people. On top of this Deputy Chairman of the Ispolkom A. Korobitsin, a person who, putting it mildly, does not enjoy authority, became the commissioner for the obkom secretary for some reason. This is how it turned out: The more he argued in favor of L. Bobykin, the more the mood turned against him. No matter where he spoke, the reaction was the opposite: against rather than in favor..."

Indeed, there is something that merits consideration here. As we can see, it was not the article in the oblast newspaper that mattered. However, the struggle with the press came to extremes in some places during the election campaign. For example, in Nevyansk the leaders of the gorkom went as far as to destroy some of the already printed press run of the local newspaper. As they say, it does not get any worse than that. However, it still did not influence the voters "in the official spirit": They remained of the same opinion, and elected the person they wanted.

No, we do need to say this most definitively time and time again: The time of crude authoritarian pressure is coming to an end. The genuine authority of a particular person increasingly often tips the scales of public opinion. As a rule, this is an authority of people committing specific actions, social deeds.

As I have once again become convinced in Sverdlovsk Oblast, not everything in this matter is straightforward and unambiguous. The people's judge of Leninskiy Rayon, L. Kudrin, threw out the case against a participant in the unauthorized meeting—"based on the absence of an administrative law violation in the actions of the accused." They tried to "pressure" the judge, and in response he submitted his resignation and surrendered his party membership card. He took a job as a loader. This was a sharp reaction and, perhaps, not commensurate.

Subsequently, in conjunction with repeat elections, the former judge and current loader was nominated a candidate people's deputy, and was elected. No matter what we think of it, we cannot, first, ignore the fact that such a person gained the definite sympathy of many people, and, second, fail to regret that he has remained outside the party. It is a pity and it is disappointing that it has indeed come to this. Don't we in the party need people who have convictions and are prepared to defend them?

Here is another fact that I have encountered in Pervouralsk. Here, at the complete metal assemblies plant, a meeting of brigades "flared up" at the beginning of a work day with a demand to drastically cut the managerial personnel of the enterprise. It was said that the number of such personnel is incredibly inflated; meanwhile, there are many unsound things in the matter of labor organization and wages, in the rates, norms, and tariffs; the transition of sections to contract work is being delayed. It ended up in the establishment of an authoritative commission of representatives of the administration and the workers for a substantive consideration of the proposals made. One and the same person was both among the organizers of the meeting and on the commission: brigade leader of the mill operators Sergey Galat. When after the meeting he appealed to its participants for making up the hours lost during the week, the people supported him with applause. They indeed returned the hours! As you can see, the collective followed the comrade.

Being aware of this, I read with interest in the city newspaper an interview with Chairman of the Party Commission at the Pervouralsk CPSU Gorkom Yu. Tokarev. The correspondent asked him the following question: "Perestroyka has also created the phenomenon of an informal leader. Some leading functionaries cannot wait to brand them extremists, and so forth. What is your attitude toward this?"

The answer was: "I would treat people more carefully. I know Sergey Galat from the complete metal assemblies plant well. He is an excellent organizer and knows how to talk to comrades. It could be that he gets carried away on negative points. However, why should not the party buro regard Galat as an ally in combating drawbacks? Informal leaders are the ones who are respected by the people for their human qualities rather than their position. I do not believe that a drunkard or a self-seeker, a dishonest employee, has risen to become such a leader. In turn, it is the duty of the party organization to help them in maturing and to reinforce the ranks of genuine proponents of perestroyka."

First Secretary of the Pervouralsk Gorkom of the party V. Vasiltsov talked to me about the same. This is an exceptionally important topic! I recalled that in the Sverdlovsk Gorkom they told me: The party committee of the Verkh-Iset Iron and Steel Plant nominated one worker as candidate USSR people's deputy, while the collective nominated another, the heat treater Valeriy Shmotyev. He was the one to become deputy.

As you can see, such "gaps" between the opinion of the party committee and the collective still happen, and, as I understood, still frequently. If you think about it, there should not be a gap here. The essential point of party work at present is for the so-called informal leader and the so-called formal leader to be combined in the same person in an increasingly integral manner. What will unite them? Only their genuine rather than fake authority.

Zalygin Gives Publishing Plans for Journal

18001359 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 12 Jul 89 p 7

[Article by Sergey Zalygin, editor in chief of the NOVYY MIR: "What Do You Have?"]

[Text] *Almost since the beginning of the year LITERATURNAYA GAZETA readers have been asking the editors to discuss the plans for literary-artistic journals of the USSR Union of Writers and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Union of Writers for 1990. Their impatience is quite easily explained—the competition has been very keen during the past 3 years and it has been extremely difficult to make a selection.*

The division for literary life asked the editors in chief of "thick" journals to answer the following questions:

1. Did they manage to do everything they had intended?

2. Which publication, in your view, was the most successful?

3. What do you intend to publish in 1990?

There was an immense selection of manuscripts; by now the editors have accumulated about 3,000 of them.... At meetings of the editorial board where the content of the issues is planned, one might say that they are wall-to-wall. There is a contest for each column of space, and there are quite a few of them—272— for our journal is the "thickest" of the thick.

But with all of this it is still clear that we cannot reach a level higher than the current literature. And God knows how they cater to the readers. The writers are writing little—more and more they are speaking at plenums, congresses, and meetings of factions, which people join and then leave. But have many good novels surfaced during the past 2-3 years? This is not discussed at the plenums.

We are still receiving works that were written during the times of stagnation or sometimes even before them—Platonov, Pasternak, Shalamov, Tendryakov, Abramov, Tvardovskiy have been rescuing us up to the present time and we shall continue to publish them up to the end of the year; and they will also occupy an important place in the selection for 1990. In particular I have in mind the voluminous diaries of A. Tvardovskiy which are being prepared for us by his widow, M.I. Tvardovskaya.

I shall also mention Solzhenitsyn, his story "Cancer Ward," his novel "The First Circle," and, probably, some of his commentary. It has already been announced in the press that before the end of this year we shall publish "GULAG Archipelago." LITERATURNAYA GAZETA reported that A.M. Solzhenitsyn granted V.M. Borisov and me the right to disseminate his works in the Soviet Union. Of course we are going to take advantage of this right.

The flow of literature from abroad from emigre writers of all generations is not drying up. I am somewhat surprised about this—we have published so little of their work, and they include V. Nabokov, I. Brodskiy, N. Korzhavin, and in the next few issues we shall publish A. Remizov and Z. Shakovskaya. That is it for the time being but the manuscripts keep coming and coming to us endlessly. But, I repeat, we have so little space....

I also think that many currently prospering Soviet writers are greatly indebted to us, and in 1990 they should undoubtedly fulfill their promises both to the editors and to the readers.

Who are they, our "debtors"?

Chingiz Aytmatov and his "Mother of God in the Snow."

Viktor Astafyev with his war novel.

Andrey Bitov with "Notes from the Corner."

Daniil Granin with "History of Love."

Valentin Rasputin with his new stories (or essays about Siberia—that is his decision).

V. Belov and V. Bykov have kept their promises—their manuscripts are in our files.

Commentary evokes an immense and quite natural interest in our times, and here we can promise the articles of V. Salyunin, G. Popov, S. Kondrashov, and also certain of our religious figures. In my view, these articles are exceptionally interesting.

They have not promised anything firmly enough, but still we are hoping that the economists N. Shmelev and V. Leontyev will participate in our journal.

We shall continue the cycle "From the History of Russian Socio-Philosophical Thought." Enthusiastic reader response was evoked by this section of our commentary and literary criticism—articles and letters from Vladimir Solovyev and G.P. Fedotov. V.V. Rozanov is about to be published. We are hoping that this interest will continue to grow with the publication of such authors as S.N. Bulgakov, N.A. Berdyayev, L.P. Karsavin, and other Russian philosophers of the end of last century and the beginning of this one.

For this philosophy was just barely becoming a part of our domestic culture—it is unique and just as national as it is generally human, based on the history of the people

and the state—when the Russian-speaking person was deprived of it in his homeland. And the people were not deprived of it accidentally, but deliberately and vigorously.

Even if it is late, this gap must be filled—at first the dotted line in this direction will be made by the journal, and then, of course, the book publishers will take up the work.

Literary criticism is the most workable genre for us. We almost never celebrate the anniversaries of the "great," "outstanding" and "eminent" writers, even if they were geniuses—Gogol, Pushkin, Akhmatova, and so it is almost impossible to plan articles for this section. But our requirements and the approach to materials in this section are as follows: We are not a weekly and we shall never keep pace with a weekly—and we do not set this task for ourselves, and we are certainly not interested in sensationalism. We are mostly interested in a certain degree of fundamental importance of literary-critical works. If we feel that the work will not lose its significance in 3 or 5 years—it shall be among the first that we accept for publication.

And we hope that it is in this sense that we shall justify the hopes of our critics and literary scholars who are writing about the most important problems of culture—S. Averintsev, I. Solotusskiy, A. Latynina, K. Myalo, and M. Chudakova.

Briefly about poetry:

This is the situation here: We think that we have succeeded in "skimming off the cream" that has accumulated on poetry over many years. This includes the works of D. Andreyev, N. Klyuyev, I. Severyanin, M. Volyushin, A. Vvedenskiy, O. Mandelshtam, Ye. Vasilyev, Ya. Smelyakov, and I. Yelagin.

By now this layer of cream is apparently gone and we are not likely to find any more such outstanding names.

Nonetheless we are placing our hopes in the authors who have been discovered on our pages.

I have in mind M. Avvakumov, V. Antonov, O. Nikolayeva, S. Nadeyev, and Vl. Kornilov.

A couple of words about the works of foreign literature and also the literature of the people of the USSR.

As concerns the former, we have a very large selection. Because it is so large we have not yet fully investigated it.

There are certain difficulties with the literature that comes in from the republics. Translation takes a very large amount of time, and when it is finally finished the author is in a hurry to submit it to the book publisher. This is understandable: For he does not know whether or not the journal will accept his work, and then it might take a year before it is published, which means that the book would come out sooner.

Certain changes are needed here. We could, for example, grant the authors the right to publish the translation simultaneously in the magazine and in a book under the condition that the circulation of the book was minimal.

It could be either way, but we have already invited and still are inviting authors from the republics to present work on the pages of our journal. True, it is still too early to speak about what we can confidently promise the readers today.

Our circulation of 1,630,000, which is unprecedented for a "thick" journal, places a lot of responsibility on us.

Incidentally, if not for us then for the publishing house this kind of circulation is more than burdensome.

This number of copies are printed in no more or less than seven typographic enterprises and the readers still frequently receive them late.

We know that the situation must be rectified, but how—this we do not know yet.

Situation in Maritime Kray 'Serious'

LD0408212189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian in its "Vremya" newscast at 1430 GMT oN 4 August broadcasts a video report on the consequences of cyclone Judy in the Maritime Kray. Pictures show a fully flooded landcape, and the presenter says that the stormy winds and a great deal of rain have led to the national economy bearing "multi-million losses" in the Maritime kray. "More than 100 population centers have been flooded, which is 3,000 buildings," he says, adding that "almost 300 bridges have collapsed, including two railway bridges."

He notes that railway traffic between Khabarovsk and Vladivostok has been stopped, and passengers have been given temporary shelter in hotels and in carriages. He says that 120,000 hectares of arable land are underwater in the rural area. Pastures and farms have lost more than 70,000 livestock heads.

The most tragic thing, he continues, is the fact that 15 people are dead. He says the military are doing their best to help. He interviews Katkov, secretary of the kray party committee, who says that the situation is "extremely serious" and that more floods are expected in the area of Dalnerechensk. Therefore all efforts are being pooled to save works and the dam in that area, Katkov adds.

Economic

Finance Minister Discusses Fiscal Problems

LD0808200789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0750 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow, 8 Aug (TASS)—The issue of money in the USSR amounted to R9 billion in the first half of the year. Announcing this in an interview with the newspaper TRUD, Valentin Pavlov, USSR minister of finance, noted that in the last three 5-year plan periods the amount of money in circulation increased more than threefold and amounted to more than R100 billion. In a normal economy, meanwhile, the minister considers, R35-50 billion would have been sufficient. The shortage of goods in the country and the idling of the economy are leading to a situation where the total volume of cash is rising due to the constant issue, and there are increasing sums for which there is no correlation of goods and which are kept out of circulation by the population. There is now R300 billion lying in savings account books, and the experts consider that there is another R40-70 billion kept "under the mattress." Whereas there were goods to a value of R1.40 for every ruble in currency in 1960, there are now goods worth only 18 kopecks, the minister stated.

A completely abnormal situation with regard to finance has arisen, Valentin Pavlov said, because the country has been living in debt for 1 and ½ decades. More is consumed than is earned, the natural resources are destroyed, the capital stock is used up and not always replenished, the state pays out R5 billion every year to support almost 8,000 loss-making enterprises, and mismanagement costs tens of billions.

The minister said that the issue of money will have to be employed for some time yet, possibly of R3-5 billion by the end of the year. This trend must cease as a consequence of saturation of the market with consumer goods, including the extreme measures which are being undertaken. For instance, opportunities have been found to purchase goods abroad, worth in the region of R7-10 billion at retail prices.

Talking about other measures for financial improvement of the Soviet economy, the minister of finance mentioned structural perestroyka above all: increasing the consumption fund through a reduction in the accumulation fund, retooling enterprises, workshops, and sectors of the heavy and defense industries for the production of goods for the population, and reducing capital investment in major projects. In the minister's words, all of this will make it possible to increase the output of goods by R40 billion. In Valentin Pavlov's opinion, the new system of taxation of enterprises which is being introduced will also contribute to straightening out the country's financial situation.

Statistics Committee Chief Interviewed

PM0908094989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Aug 89 Morning Edition p2

[Interview with Doctor of Economic Sciences V.N. Kirichenko, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, by M. Berger under the heading "Not Only Figures Pleasant in Every Respect"—date and place unspecified]

[Text] [Berger] Vadim Nikitovich, you are head of a difficult service which—we will be frank—is not the most popular in our country. Unfortunately, the reputation of official statistics is not irreproachable: Embellishment, innuendo, strained interpretation.... People can feel and see the position they are in as consumers but read about it as being something quite different. This has probably happened because for many years attempts have been made to turn statistics into something like a "lady pleasant in every respect," with considerable success. If a figure, for whatever reason, has been unpleasant and not lent itself to "improvement"—all the worse for that figure. It simply would not appear in the reports.

Not only individual indicators have been withdrawn but also entire blocks of information. Some economists, such as G. Khanin, for example, are even producing some kind of statistics of these losses and keeping their own, alternative statistical record. Is it possible to make the right decisions without adequate, correct information?

[Kirichenko] That is not a question but a kind of accusatory conclusion.... I would not blame statistics for every sin, although the criticism addressed to it is often just. But one cannot ignore the fact that the desire to look better—even if only a little bit better—than one really does or show only the things that are pleasing—a desire so understandable in everyday life but so unacceptable at state level—has held us in its grip for a fairly long period of history. And statistics has been called upon first and foremost to "serve" this desire.

[Berger] And not only statistics, we must admit. We in the editorial office, like our colleagues on other newspapers which publish statistical reports, have gone into agonies every time, trying to find "uplifting" headlines like "Workers Put Best Foot Forward in 5-Year Plan".... I personally feel that a statistical report does not need a "rousing, poetic" headline, just as such headlines are not required, say, by lists of television programs for the week ahead or tables showing the redemption of the latest issue of state loan bonds. A report is a report. Incidentally, your most recent statistical report has been presented by IZVESTIYA in a totally neutral way, without any words like "march" or "rhythm"—"The Soviet Economy: The Results of the First 6 Months"—which is the first time this has happened, at least in recent history. Although it is really a question of content rather than title, of course.

[Kirichenko] The main problem with regard to improving the trustworthiness of statistical information is the method of calculation. For all the complaints made against statistics, they certainly could not be accused of outright deception. It is another matter that some awkward information is discounted or a phenomenon ignored. Some things really are simply removed from the reports and some information is quoted with no point of reference or not in full, so that it is impossible to analyze, compare, and follow different trends. A special method has even been invented for some indicators so as to be able to present the situation in a better light "without deception."

I remember, for example, how circulation in rural areas began to be taken into account at the beginning of the sixties. I will explain: To put it crudely, this signified the transfer of produce "from garden to garden." For example, one housewife gives another some eggs in exchange for butter. This natural exchange had never been statistically recorded anywhere. But at a certain point in time circulation in rural areas began to be included in the consumer index in order to "improve" it.

[Berger] I certainly have not heard about this before, but the calculation of per capita meat consumption is superficial. As is well known, this table includes fat, which is counted as meat (on the basis of calorie content!) and also by-products, including those which no normal human being would use as food. The upshot is 64 kilograms of meat per person, which totally amazes a great many people. Inflation is not recognized as a fact at all and therefore, as something that does not exist, is not taken into account, although every one of us can see it perfectly clearly.

The result is that, willingly or not, statistics has created a complete method basis for embellishing or "concealing" some information.

[Kirichenko] It is hard to argue with this. I will just say that one of the main tasks we have to tackle in the immediate future is to clarify and, if necessary, review these dubious methods. This will be a difficult matter, requiring serious study and a thoroughly professional approach. The layman finds it hard to understand, for example, that in some cases more detailed information could cloud or even distort the general picture, however paradoxical this may seem. A clear example of this is the so-called itemized price list for goods. It is on this basis that the amazing stability of the prices index is maintained, although prices are quite obviously rising. This method records price rises only for goods of the same type. If a new, similar commodity appears that is of the same quality and has the same characteristics but is twice the price, this is not considered a rise in prices, because the type of commodity is new.

However distressing it may be, we also have to come to grips with the "methodology discoveries" of the recent period. When there was a sharp drop in revenue from the sale of alcohol, statistical bodies began to use a method whereby this reduction did not have any impact on the dynamics of the national income. In other words, the reality was placed in parentheses.

Now, I repeat, all this is being very carefully investigated and revised. What is more, we want to not simply obtain and publish the correct data across an increasingly broad spectrum but to acquaint the public with the way in which we calculate this or that figure. That way people will have the possibility to analyse and, where necessary, point out the shortcomings in our methods.

[Berger] It is still hard at present to discuss the methods of calculation used by the State Committee for Statistics when compiling its latest report, published the other day, but I hope that we will soon learn of these methods. But as far as the figures themselves are concerned, they offer abundant food for thought—incomparably more than in the past. And, judging by the collection of quite new data, we are going to be able to witness fundamental changes in the information policies of the State Committee for Statistics. Or is that not so?

[Kirichenko] I hope that it is so. If some important, wide-ranging phenomena are taking place in our life, we simply do not have the right to ignore them. As we have got onto the subject of information policy, we see the point of this policy as being to adequately reflect what is happening in our economy and satisfy public interest as fully as possible.

Within this context, there is a particularly large number of new entries in the section "Social Development." For example, this is the first time the total volume of the country's labor resources has been given.

[Berger] It is interesting that this figure did not find a place in the recently published 300-page special collection of statistics, "Labor in the USSR."

[Kirichenko] But it does give a more detailed picture of employment than has been the case in the past, taking account of its social structure and new trends—real disengagement from material production and the move to cooperatives—which naturally changes people's social bearings. We intend to study the problem of employment more closely.

[Berger] However, you have still decided not to term as unemployed those people who, according to the report, are not in employment because of the seasonal nature of their work or other reasons—people who, under certain conditions, could be engaged in social production. We are, after all, talking about almost 6 million people, according to your statistics. Although you do call other things by their real names, strikes included. But quite recently they were diffidently referred to as a "temporary refusal to work."

[Kirichenko] Well, what can you do if this is also part of our reality—an appreciable part. A total of 2 million man-days have been lost in the first 6 months, and that figure does not include the July peak of miners' strikes.

[Berger] Yes, in this respect we have somehow imperceptibly but very rapidly reached "world standards" and even overtaken some developed countries.

[Kirichenko] Whatever, we must learn to correctly assess the losses from strike action in relation to all our economic ties.

If you recall, the Congress of USSR People's Deputies raised the question of the growing income differentation among the population. We have tried to answer this question. You can learn from the report how many people have an average income of up to R75 per month and how many have a monthly income of more than R250.

[Berger] It should certainly be pointed out that, judging by the figures you have quoted, the curve of growth in the population's income has proved to be one of the most "curved" of all against the background of all the other indicators.

[Kirichenko] Yes, whereas last year the wages fund for the national economy as a whole rose by 6 percent, an increase of 9.5 percent has been registered already for the first 6 months of this year. The phenomenon has become potentially explosive: In the last 18 months the average wage has increased as much as in all the previous 7 years together. The fervor with which enterprises and organizations are increasing the wages of their workers has led to a paradox: People's income is growing, while there is no improvement in their real wellbeing. The whole problem is that this growth has no material backup and is poorly linked to the end product of labor. Take a look at the report: In industry there has been an average wage increase of 1.8 percent against 1 percent growth in labor productivity; in construction—2.1 percent; and in railroad transport—4.0 percent. Where are the goods coming from to match this income?

[Berger] But let us not forget the point of reference. We are still a country with one of the lowest wages funds as a proportion of the national income.

[Kirichenko] I agree that incomes must grow and that the debt accumulated from economizing for many years at people's expense must be repaid. But—on the basis of real economic possibilities. What is the point of paying money with which there is nothing to buy? Look at the state of the consumer market. This is now one of the most serious problems and one that is being increasingly exacerbated by the rapid rise in income and the shortfalls in meeting targets for consumer goods production.

[Berger] However, judging by your report, the plan for commodity circulation has been overfulfilled, which has not happened for a long time.

[Kirichenko] But you will also read at what cost this was achieved—we did not give such details in the past. One-third of the increase was achieved through the sale of alcoholic beverages and another one-quarter is accounted for by a rise in the average retail prices. And as far as the increase in food production is concerned, it is insignificant and barely keeps up with natural population growth.

[Berger] Judging by the fact that in this 6 months we have had to increase grain purchases (by 20 percent), butter purchases (8 times), and fish purchases (2 times) in comparison to the same period last year, as well as purchases of other food products, the situation in the agrarian sector is not very good. Incidentally, these figures are also a "statistical novelty." We have not seen them in past reports.

[Kirichenko] However critical our report—and henceforth criticism must be one of the principles of the State Committee for Statistics' information policy—I would also like to draw attention to some serious positive trends. These are primarily structural changes. The rate of growth in output of group "B" products is more than double that of group "A" products. In the machine-building sector, the output of progressive types of machinery and equipment has increased at a more rapid rate.

[Berger] Nevertheless, the general rate of economic growth is below last year's level, which is recorded in the statistical report.

[Kirichenko] First of all, this fact has been recorded and underlined, which means that no attempts have been made to draw a veil over this unpleasant information. And, second, discussions are continuing on the subject of whether the country needs high rates or not.

[Berger] This prompts another question: Is the present drop the result of a conscious policy or a sign that we are "out of breath"?

[Kirichenko] Unfortunately, in this case there can be no talk of a deliberate slowing of growth rates, although, in my opinion, everyone now realizes that these growth rates cannot, per se, serve as a criterion of economic growth and development. But, on the other hand, saying that high growth rates could be the cause of our problems is also impossible. Strictly speaking, on the basis of the 1988 results we have only reached a level of growth in the national income equivalent to the average annual indicator of the 11th 5-year period. That very same 5-year period which we have termed stagnant precisely because of the low rates of economic growth.

Then, in a number of areas we need both growth rate and quality. Take housing. We need square meters, and the more the better. But in this 6-month period we relinquished the positions we had won quite recently. And the same is true of food production.

I agree that growth rates are not an aim in themselves and that in a number of areas a slowing of these rates can only be an advantage. But the problem must be approached with thought and not shied away from. The same is true with regard to the question of reducing capital investments, for example. This is a popular subject at the moment and I also am in favor of a reasonable reduction in investments. But let us think about it. Housing accounts for 16 percent of state capital investments. Projects in the agro-industrial complex and the social sphere must remain untouched. This basically leaves only production construction. We have a situation where the proposal to cut total capital investment by 30 percent, which is the figure now being talked about, will, in the final analysis, result in cuts in industrial investments almost double this. Will the result not be that we take such a downwards dive in this area that we will never be able to come to the surface again? Our approach must be very carefully thought out in this respect.

[Berger] Vadim Nikitovich, what other changes are planned in the information policy of the State Committee for Statistics?

[Kirichenko] As I have already said, many methods are being reviewed, particularly the method of calculating the harvest yield, so that people have a real idea of the situation. Another step will be an invariable policy to reduce so-called confidential information. We will increase the range of openness in statistics, without which, incidentally, our full integration into world economic relations will be impossible. In short, we will endeavor to make our statistics as accurate and full as possible.

Aerospace Industry To Reconvert Capacities

LD0808161789 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 7 Aug 89

[Text] The Soviet aerospace industry is expected to reconvert half of its capacity for consumer production by 1995. This follows a statement by the Soviet minister for the general machine engineering. He said his ministry had been authorized to re-equip the food processing industry, and this year it planned that military facilities are to produce consumer goods for the population worth R27,000 million.

Agricultural

Help Requested for Ukraine Grain Harvest

PM0908084189 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 15 Jul 89 p 1

[Report by A. Gorobets: "Presented to Addressee. Measures Are Being Taken"; first four paragraphs are PRAVDA UKRAINY introduction]

[Text] USSR People's Deputy Twice Hero of Socialist Labor D.K. Motornyy, chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Collective Farms [kolkhozes] Council, after an alarm telegram from PRAVDA UKRAINY, made a request to the state leaders. We report below what is being done about this request.

"You cannot stop the harvest" was the headline under which PRAVDA UKRAINY published on 7 July 1989 an agricultural review which discussed the alarming situation in the present harvest. The harvest process is being interrupted now in one region of the republic, now in another: The countryside lacks fuel and lubricants. Yet an excellent grain harvest has been grown in almost all soil and climatic zones in the Ukraine.

The obstacles in the harvest are also losses. That is why on behalf of the rural workers and PRAVDA UKRAINY readers the editorial office sent a telegram to D.K. Motornyy, chairman of the Ukrainian republican kolkhozes council, who is taking part in the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It requested that, as a deputy, he ask N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers: What is being done to supply petroleum products in an adequate quantity to the farms of the Ukraine, where a good grain harvest has ripened?

Our correspondent got in touch with Dmitriy Konstantinovich Motornyy yesterday. Here is what the people's deputy said:

Last Friday, 7 July, the CPSU Central Committee commission for questions of agrarian policy was working. As I set off for its sitting I already knew from telephone calls from the localities, from the leaders of the Ukrainian SSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, of the alarming, depressing state of affairs on the kolkhozes and state farms [sovkhozes] with regard to motor gasoline, diesel fuel, and hydraulic oils. And although I received the PRAVDA UKRAINY telegram later, it was about that, about the stoppages in the harvest, that I spoke as soon as I had the opportunity at the commission sitting.

I said that if we proclaim from every rostrum and sing songs about how grain is the master of everything then we do not have the moral right to allow even one km of the grain grown through hard labor to die because of the shortfall in the delivery of petroleum products. I spoke of the situation whereby the pipelines pumping thousands and thousands of tonnes of petroleum products to foreign countries are droning underground while on the surface, in the fields, combines and grain freighters are standing idle with empty tanks.

Obviously, my speech stung to the quick Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who was chairing the sitting. P.I. Mostovoy, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers was invited to the auditorium here where the commission was working to give explanations. But he was unable to give any kind of intelligible answer to the questions put to him. He had

obviously not yet taken control of the situation. But he said that he knew of the state of affairs and that it would be put right at any cost in the very near future.

The next day, 8 July, with the PRAVDA UKRAINY telegram this time, I went to be received by L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers since, as you know, N.I. Ryzhkov was away. Comrade Voronin listened to me attentively and said that by a decision of the country's government 1.2 million tonnes of petroleum products are being removed from export in the third quarter of the year so that the bulk can be sent to the Ukraine and to Stavropol and Krasnodar Kray, where a good grain and pulse harvest has been raised.

On Monday 10 July this was confirmed by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, when I approached him with the telegram in the interval between sittings. Yes, the Council of Ministers chairman said, the country's government, concerned for the harvest's fate, has today undertaken a substantial reduction in the export of petroleum products. Now it is up to the railroad workers, Nikolay Ivanovich stressed, and up to the workers of the State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum Products who must display the utmost efficiency and good management so that the fuels and lubricants which have been allocated can be delivered to consumers in the very near future.

On N.I. Ryzhkov's advice I asked G.V. Kolbin, chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee, to help the republic's rural workers in the additional allocation of railroad tanks. This request was met with understanding, and measures are being taken for the urgent delivery of petroleum products to consumers, primarily in the Ukraine, where a critical situation has taken shape.

In brief, D.K. Motornyy concluded our talk, I am not removing the problem from the agenda.

Nikonov Visits Ukraine Fodder Research Center

LD0808215389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Aug 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Viktor Petrovich Nikonov is in the Ukraine.

[Correspondent V. Golubev] [Passage omitted describing yield of alfalfa field] Today, the CPSU Central Committee secretary acquainted himself with the work of the scientists of the Vinnitsa fodder research institute. [passage omitted: milk production in the country is growing very slowly; institute director Babich says area sown to soy beans in the oblast has increased fourfold; laboratory head Olishinskiy describes qualities of a new fodder- harvesting device that makes possible a 12-15-percent increase in performance] [video shows alfalfa fields, Nikonov and entourage inspecting crops, Nikonov looking on while Babich is interviewed, close-up shot of harvester part with diagram]

Military

Belorussian Military Exercise Scheduled 15-22 Aug

LD0808162989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1607 GMT 8 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow, 8 Aug (TASS)—During the period 15-22 August, in the territory of Belorussia in the region of Dubrovo, Shatsk, Berezino and Ulla, a troop exercise of the Belorussian Military District will be held to test administrative arrangements and interaction and to perfect the troops' field training.

Formations and units of ground troops and air forces are being brought into the exercise. The overall number of troops taking part in the exercise will be 17,400.

In accordance with the Stockholm Conference document, the USSR Government has invited to the exercise observers from all the member-states of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Ethnic Relations in Armed Forces Discussed

PM0908090589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Aug 89 First Edition p 4

["Our correspondent" report: "With a Specific Program"]

[Text] Problems of the international education of Armed Forces personnel in the context of the country's sociopolitical situation and the demands of perestroyka were examined at a recent session of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate Commission on Interethnic Relations. Fleet Admiral A. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, delivered the report.

The report and the speeches of Comrades D. Zhilnikov, A. Skoryy, A. Sidorov, L. Kucherov, A. Rychkov, and others thoroughly analyzed the work of political organs and party organizations to rally multinational military collectives and the reasons for the exacerbation of interethnic relations in some subunits. For example, figures from sociological research were cited: Around 10 percent of the young inducted into the Army and Navy this year were raised in families with ethnic prejudices and many young men were involved in various types of national conflicts before being drafted for active service. All this is bound to affect the situation in military collectives. The political organs and party organizations of units and ships must work consistently and purposefully to cleanse the minds of a certain proportion of young soldiers and sailors of elements of nationalism and everything which contradicts our morality and ideology. A large role must be played in this by interethnic relations commissions and groups at the local level.

It was noted at the session that the more specifically these ideological formations are led by political organs, the more effectively they work. Ceremonial meetings between the new inductees from union and autonomous

republics and soldiers and sergeants of these nationalities have been introduced in many units and ships. Republic days and ten-day periods are being held, the traditions and customs of the nations and nationalities of the USSR and their history and culture are being studied, and rooms and corners of international friendship are being set up. All this unites people and makes their relations purer and more respectful. At the same time, it was stressed at the session, interethnic relations groups and commissions are sometimes not sufficiently consistent and thorough in their work and often grope their way without taking sufficient account of the national psychology of the personnel and the regional situation. Contacts with the local party and social organizations are weak and sporadic. And political organs, party committees, and party bureaus do not show due concern for scientific, material, and cadre support for the commissions and groups and allow their work to drift.

Specific ways for further perestroyka and improvement of political, organizational, and ideological work on the international education of Army and Navy personnel were outlined in the report and speeches.